23. 4. 25

John Christie
his Book London
May 25th 1769

William Christie Purchased
this Book from John Christie
Fallon: June 30th 1795.

William Christie having died
January 5th 1812 this Book
now belongs to Robert Christie

SC #1500

CHRIST ON HIS THRONE.

OR,

Christs Church-government briefly laid downe; and how it ought to bee set up in all Christian Congregations.

Resolved in sundry Cases of Conscience.

IER. 6.16.

Thus saith the Lord; Stand ye in the wayes, and see and aske for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall finde rest for your soules.

LVKE 19.27.

But those mine Enemies, which would not that I should raigne over them, bring them hither and slay them before me.

Printed in the yeare 1640.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://archive.org/details/diocesanstryallw00bayn

THE
DIOCESANS TRYALL,

WHEREIN

The maine Controverſies about the **Forme or Governement of the Churches of Chriſt** are judiciouſly ſtated, and learnedly diſcuſſed in the opening and thorough debating of theſe three Queſtions following,

viz.

1. *Whether Chriſt did inſtitute, or the Apoſtles frame any Dioceſan forme of Churches, or Whether Pariſhionall only?*
2. *Whether Chriſt ordained by himſelfe or by his Apoſtles any ordinary Paſtours, having both precedencie of order and majority of power over others?*
3. *Whether Chriſt did Immediately commit ordinary power Eccleſiaſticall, and the exerciſe of it, to any one ſingular perſon, or to an united multitude of Preſbyters?*

A worke ſeaſonable and uſefull for theſe times, being very helpefull to the deciding of the differences now in queſtion upon this ſubject.

Written long ſince by that Famous and learned Divine, Mr PAUL BAYNE.

And now Publiſhed by Authority.

LONDON,

Printed for *John Bellamie*, and are to be ſould at his Shop at the Signe of the three Golden-Lyons in Cornehill neare the Royall-Exchange, M. DC. XLIV.

DIOCESAN TRAVAIL.

THE PREFACE.

MAny writings, and sermons also have cause to wish that the men from whom they come were lesse knowen then they are. For then should they be free from much prejudice, and find better acceptance with those that they come to. But I wish nothing more unto this Treatise, which is now cõming into the world, then that the Author of it were throughly known unto all those that shall meet with it; for then his work would need no borrowed commendation, the title it self carrying authority with it, even to force respect from every honest Reader, if either the sharpnes of wit, variety of reading, depth of judgment, aptnes to teach, holy and pleasant language, heavenly conversation, wise cariage, or any fulnes of grace wil so far prevail with him. I doe not abuse good words, or load one with thhem whom they do not belong to, as many painters of Sepulchrs in their funerall Orations use to do: but speak that in short, which M. Baines his person did largly preach unto all such as came neer unto him: & that which his incomparable writings wil sufficiently witnes to futur generations.

Neither is this all that the Authours quality may suggest unto the considerate Reader: but he may arise from this to more important thoughts; especially if the remembrance of M. Baines his worth do occasion him to think of many others like unto him: such as M. Deering, M. More M. Greenham, M. Perkins, M. Rogers, M. Cartwright, M. Fenner, M. Brightman, M. Parker, M. Philips, M. Hieron, and M. Bradshaw &c. to speak nothing of those which yet live, nor of D. Reinolds, D. Fulk, and D. Whitakers with many others. For all these being apprehẽded as mẽ agreeing in one spirit, & having had indeed the spirit of glory resting on them, as their works do shew, together with those letters testimonial which they left written in the hearts of many thousand Christians, it must needs cause at the least an inquiry, what

the reason should be what such famous men of God, could never like wel of our Bishoply courses in England, nor ever be favoured of them. The case is plaine to all: and the cause is as evident to those that have eyes to see: but no where more apparant then in the person of M. Baines, and the place where he, and others like him were made signes of this antipathie. Cambridge is or should be, as an eye to all our land: so that the alterations that fall out there cannot but be felt of all parts. It is the place of light; the spirituall oppressions which in other corners are covered with darkneſſe (as all the works of darkneſſe would be) when past all shame they come to confront the Sunne it selfe, how can they then be hidden?

When M. Perkins had there for many yeares held forth a burning and shining light, the sparks wherof did flie abroad into all corners of the land, and after he had served his time was taken up into heaven, there was none found so meet for to receive, as it were, the torch out of his hand, and succeed him in that great office of bearing it before such a people, as this M. Bains, upon whom also the spirit of that Elias, was by experience found to be doubled. In this station he so demeaned himself for some years, that impietie only had cause to complaine: for all that favoured the waies of God, rejoyced and gloried in him and his Ministery, as a spirituall treasure. But at length the hower of darknes came from Lambeth, when Arch. Bancroft sent M. Harsenet to Visite as they call it, that is (if termes may be interpreted by common practise) to pick the purses of poore men, and to suppresse those that are not friends to the Bishops Kingdome. For though in that circuit there were a multitude of unable and notoriously scandalous Ministers, yet none were found worthy of censure, but only M. Baines, of whom the world was not worthy, and one other Preacher like unto him. Now it is hard to say, whether the silencing of him was more odious, or the manner of it shameles. There must be a Sermon (ye know) at such Visitations, for fashion sake, though the Visiter himself can seldom find leasure to make it. This part was therfore appointed to M. Bains by

the

the Visiters, that he might either be insnared in his words; if he did not apply himself to their humours, or else grace their ungratious courses, if he did. But it did not succeed handsomly either way: For he delivered wholesome doctrine appertaining to the present audience, in such warie manner, that no specious occasion could be taken therby of questioning his liberty. Yet fairely or fouly the mischievous intention must not faile. M. Baines having heat his weak body by straining to speak unto a great audience, retired himselfe presently upon his comming down from the Pulpit to provide for his health, which otherwise would have bin indangered. They in the meã time going on with their businesse, as they are wont in the masterly forme of a muster, called for M. Baines amongst the rest, and upon his not answering, though he was not cited thither as to a Court, but only intreated to preach, as he did, yet for not appearing, he was immediately silenced. Afterward in deed, the Chancellor being informed of that grosse nullity, which was in the sentence, urged him about subscription and conformity; and so to make sure work, silenced him over again: In which businesse he was so conscious unto himself of unreasonable and ridiculous dealing, that when M. Baines standing to receive the sentence of a corrupt man, did lift up his heart and eies unto God with a heavenly smiling countenance, as he used, he interpreted that gesture to be a skorne of his authority. This being don, M. Baines was perswaded by his friends to try the Archbishops courtesie, unto whom, when he presented himself, at the very first salutation; the gravity and severity of B. Bancroft led him sharply to rebuke the good man for a little black-work, which was upon the edges of his cuffes, asking him how he durst come before him with such cuffs, telling him very bishoplike, that it were a good turn to lay him by the heels for so doing. After this he would have no more to do with such absurd unreasonable men: but preached sometime when he might have liberty, as his weakenesse of body would suffer; and spent the rest of his time in reading, meditating, praying and writing, saving that upon occasion hee did

instruct or comfort those which came to him in private; wherin he had a heavenly gift. He was indeed all his life after, beside the weakenes of his body pressed with want, no having (as he often complained to his friends) a place to rest his head in: which me thought was an upbraiding of the age and place where he lived with base regardlesnes of piety & learning: yet he never so much as consulted with himselfe of denying his sinceritie by pleasing the Bishops, of whom and their courses he was wont to say, *They are a generation of the earth, earthly, and savour not the waies of God.* Which saying of his, they, and some Doctors of Cambridge have since made good, in that they could not indure, that the place from whence they thrust him, should be supplied by other honest men, though they were cõformable, but with absolute authority at length forbad it, alledging that Puritanes were made by that lecture: wheras the truth is, that one lecture hath done more good to the Church of God in England, then all the doctors of Cambridge: though I doe not deny, but some of them have wrought a good work.

By this one instance (of which kind I would there were not a 100 in our land) it may easily appeare to the understanding Reader, that here is as much agreement betwixt our Bishops in their managing of Religion (except some 2 or 3, which went out of their elements, when they ventered on those places) & those powerful Preachers who have bin the chief means of revealing Gods arme unto salvation, as there is betwixt the light which commeth down from heaven, & that thick mist which ariseth from the loweſt pit.

But wee need not seeke for demonstrations of the spirit which worketh in our Hierarchie from this opposition, look but at the fruits of it, wher it hath all fulnes of consent, as Cathedrall Pallaces, or Parishes of Bishops and Archbishops residence, such as Lambeth is, where all their canons are in force, and have their full sway without contradiction: nay come neerer unto them, and take a view of their families, even to them that wait in their chambers, and see what godlinesse there is to be found. Have there not more of God and his Kingdome appeared in some one Congregation

the Bishops, Chancellours, Archdeacons, &c. being, as it were, their promotors, informers, and executioners, in all matters of jurisdiction and government, for to bring in mony into their purses: for performance also of which service to them, the Church-wardens upon every occasion are enforced to take such corporall oathes as not one of them doth ever keep. What other ground of this, beside the fore-mentioned, that particular Congregations are no spirituall incorporations, and therefore must have no officers for government within themselves?

Now all these confusions with many others of the same kind, how they are condemned in the very foundation of them, M. Bains here sheweth in the first question, by maintaining the divine constitution of a particular Church, in one Congregation. In which question he maintaineth against his adversaries a course not unlike to that which Armachanus, in the daies of King Edward the third, contended for against the begging Friers in his booke called *The defence of Curates*: For when those Friers incroached upon the priviledges of Parochiall Ministers, he withstood them upon these grounds: *Ecclesia Parochialis juxta verba Mosis Deut. 12. est locus electus a Deo, in quo debemus accipere cuncta quæ præcipit Dominus ex Sacramentis. Parochus est ordinarius Parochiani: est persona a Deo præcepta, vel mandato Dei ad illud ministerium explendum electa:* which if they be granted, our adversaries cause may goe a begging with the foresaid Friers.

Another sort of corruptions there are, which though they depend upon the same ground with the former, yet immediately flow out of the Hierarchie. What is more dissonant from the revealed will of Christ in the Gospell, even also from the state of the Primitive Church, then that the Church and Kingdome of Christ should be managed as the Kingdomes of the world, by a Lordly authority, with externall pompe, commanding power, contentious courts of judgement, furnished with chancellors, officials, commissaries, advocates, proctors, paritors, and such like humane devices? Yet all this doth necessarily follow up-

on the admitting of such Bishops as ours are in England: who not onely are Lords over the flock, but doe professe so much in the highest degree, when they tell us plainly, that their Lawes or Canons doe binde mens consciences. For herein we are like the people of Israel, who would not have God for their immediate King, but would have such Kings as other Nations: Even so the Papists, and we after them, refuse to have Christ an immediate King in the immediate government of the Church; but must have Lordly Rulers with state in Ecclesiasticall affaires, such as the world hath in civill.

What a miserable pickle are the most of our Ministers in, when they are urged to give an account of their calling? To a Papist indeed they can give a shifting answer, that they have ordination from Bishops, which Bishops were ordained by other Bishops, and they, or their ordainers by Popish Bishops: this in part may stop the mouth of a Papist: but let a Protestant which doubteth of these matters move the question, and what then will they say? If they flie to popish Bishops, as they are popish, then let them goe no longer masked under the name of Protestants. If they alledge succession by them from the Apostles, then (to say nothing of the appropriating of this succession unto the Popes chaire, in whose name, and by whose authority our English Bishops did all things in times past) then I say they must take a great time for the satisfying of a poore man concerning this question, and for the justifying of their station. For untill that out of good records they can shew a perpetuall succession from the Apostles unto their Diocesan which ordained them, and untill they can make the poore man which doubteth, perceive the truth and certainty of those records, (which I wish they will doe at leasure) they can never make that succession appeare. If they flye to the Kings authority, the King himselfe will forsake them, and deny that he taketh upon him to make or call Ministers. If to the present Bishops and Archbishops, alas they are as farre to seeke as themselves, and much further. The proper cause of all this

misery

misery is the lifting up of a lordly Prelacy, upon the ruines of the Churches liberties.

How intollerable a bondage is it, that a Minister being called to a charge, may not preach to his people except he hath a licence from the Bishop or Archbishop: Cannot receive the best of his Congregation to communion if he be censured in the spirituall Courts, though it be but for not paying of six pence which they required of him in any name, be the man otherwise never so innocent: nor keep one from the communion, that is not presented in those Courts, or being presented is for money absolved, though he be never so scandalous: and must often times (if hee will hold his place) against his conscience put backe those from communion with Christ, whom Christ doth call unto it (as good Christians if they will not kneele) and receive those that Christ putteth backe, at the command of a mortall man.

What a burthen are poore Ministers prest with, in that many hundreds of them depend upon one Bishop and his Officers: they must hurry up to the spirituall Court upon every occasion, there to stand with cap in hand, not onely before a Bishop, but before his Chancellour, to bee railed on many times at his pleasure: to be censured, suspended, deprived, for not observing some of those canons which were of purpose framed for snares, when far more ancient and honest canons are every day broken by these Iudges themselves for lucre sake, as in the making of Vtopian Ministers, who have no people to minister unto; in their holding of commendams, in their taking of money, even to extortion, for orders and institutions: in their symony, as well by giving as by taking: and in all their idle, covetous, and ambitious pompe? For all these and such like abuses, we are beholding to the Lordlinesse of our Hierarchy: which in the root of it, is here overthrown by M. Bayne, in the conclusions of the second and third Question. About which he hath the very same controversie, that Marsilius Paravinus in part undertooke long since, about the time of Edward the second, against the Pope.

For he in his booke called *Defensor pacis*, layeth the same grounds that here are maintained. Some of his words, though they be large, I will here set downe for the Readers information. *Potestas clavium sive solvendi & ligandi, est essentialis & inseparabilis Presbyterio in quantum Presbyter est. In hac authoritate, Episcopus à Sacerdote non differt, teste Hieronymo, imo verius Apostolo, cujus etiam est aperta sententia. Inquit enim Hieronymus super Mat. 16: Habent quidem eandem judiciariam potestatem alii Apostoli, habet omnes Ecclesia in Presbyteris & Episcopis: proponens in hoc Presbyteros, quoniam authoritas hac debetur Presbytero, in quantum Presbyter, primo, & secundum quod ipsum. &c.* Many things are there discoursed to the same purpose, dict. 2. c. 15. It were too long to recite all. Yet one thing is worthy to be observed how he interpreteth a phrase of Ierome so much alledged, and built upon by the Patrons of our Hierarchy. Ierome saith ad Evagr. that a Bishop doth nothing, excepting ordination, which a Presbyter may not doe. Of this testimony D. Downan avoucheth, that nothing can be more pregnant then it, to prove that Bishops were superiour to Presbyters in power of ordination. But heare what this ancient Writer saith, *Ordinatio non significat ibi potestatem conferendi, nec collationem sacrorum ordinum: sed oeconomicam potestatem regulandi vel dirigendi Ecclesiæ ritus, atque personas, quantum ad exercitium divini cultus in templo; unde ab antiquis legumlatoribus vocantur Oeconomi reverendi.*

It would be over long to declare all the use which may be made of this Treatise, which being it selfe so short, forbiddeth prolixity in the Preface. If the Author had lived to have accomplished his purpose in perfecting of this worke, he would (it may be) have added such considerations as these: or at least he would have left all so clear, that any attentive Reader might easily have concluded them from his premisses. For supply of that defect, these practicall observations are noted: which with the dispute it selfe, I leave to be pondered by the conscionable Reader.

W. Ames.

The

THE FIRST QVESTION IS, WHETHER CHRIST DID INSTITUTE OR THE APOSTLES frame any Dioceſan forme of Churches, or Pariſhionall onely.

FOR determining this Queſtion, we will firſt ſet down the Arguments which affirme it. Secondly, thoſe which deny. Thirdly, lay down ſome reſponſive concluſions, and anſwer the objections made againſt that part we take to be the truth.

Thoſe who affirme the frame of Dioceſan Churches, vouch their Arguments: partly from Scripture, partly from preſidents, or inſtances ſacred and Eccleſiaſticall. Finally, from the congruity it hath with reaſon, that ſo they ſhould be conſtitute.

The firſt objection is taken from comparing thoſe two Scriptures, Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. *Ordaine Elders City by City. They ordained Elders Church by Church.* Hence it is thus argued. They who ordained that a City, with the Suburbs and regions about it, ſhould make but one Church, they ordained a Dioceſan Church. But the Apoſtles, who uſe theſe phraſes as æquipollent, *To ordaine Presbyters in every City*, and *to ordaine them in every Church*, appointed, that a city with the ſuburbes and region about it, ſhould make but one Church. Ergo, the Apoſtles conſtituted a Dioceſan Church.

The reaſon of the propoſition is, becauſe Chriſtians converted in a City, with the ſuburbes, villages, and countries about it, could not be ſo few, as to make but a Pariſhionall Church. The Aſſumption is cleare, for theſe phraſes are uſed, as *ad æquate*, and being ſo uſed, needs it muſt be that the Apoſtles framed cities, ſuburbs, and regions into one church.

2 They argue from examples: Sacred and Ecclesiasticall. Sacred are taken out of the old and new Testament. Ecclesiasticall, from the Primitive times, and from Patternes in our owne times: yea, even from such churches, as we hold reformed, as those in Belgia and Geneva.

To beginne with the church of the Jewes in the old Testament, whence they reason thus. That which many particular Synagogues were then (because they were all but one Common-wealth, and had all but one profession) that may many christian churches now bee upon the like grounds. But they then, though many Synagogues, yet because they were all but one Kingdome, and had all but one profession, were all one nationall church. Ergo, upon like grounds many churches with us, in a nation or city, may be one nationall or Diocesan church.

Secondly, the church of Jerusalem in the New Testament is objected. 1 That which the Apostles intended should be a head church to all Christians in Judea, that was a Diocesan church. But this they did by the church of Jerusalem. Ergo: 2. That which was more numbersome, then could meet Parishionally, was no Parishional but Diocesan church. But that church was such. First, by growing to 3000. then 5000. Act. 2.41. & 4.4. then to have millions in it, Act. 21.20. Ergo, the church of Jerusalem was not a Parishionall, but a Diocesan church.

Thirdly, the church of Corinth is objected to have beene a Metropolitan church. He who writing to the church of Corinth, doth write to all the Saints in Achaia with it, doth imply that they were all subordinate to that church. But this doth Paul, 1 Cor. 2.1. Ergo. Secondly He who saluteth jointly the Corinthians and Achaians, and calleth the church of Corinth by the name of Achaia, and names it with preheminence before the rest of Achaia, doth imply that the church of Corinth was the Metropolitan church to which all Achaia was subject. But the Apostle doth this, 2 Cor. 9.2. & 11. 11.8.9.10. Ergo.

Fourthly, that which was the mother city of all Macedonia, the church in that city must be, if not a Metropolitan, yet a Diocesan church. But Philippi was so. Ergo.

The fifth is from the churches of Asia, which are thus proved, at least to have beene Diocesan. 1. Those seven churches which contained all other churches in Asia strictly taken, whether in city or country; those seven were for their circuit, Metropolitan, or Diocesan churches. But those seven did containe all other in Asia. Ergo. 2. He who writing to all churches in Asia, writeth by name, but to these seven, he doth imply, that all the rest were contained in these. But Christ writing to the seven, writeth to all churches

churches in Asia, not to name that five of these were Metropolitan cities, viz. Philadelphia, and Pergamus, two Diocesan at least. 3. He who maketh the singular church he writeth to, to be a multitude of churches, not one onely (as the body is not one member onely) hee doth make that one church, to which he writeth in singular, to be a Diocesan church. But Christ in his Epiphonematicall conclusion to every church, which he had spoken to in singular, doth speake of the same as of a multitude. *Let him that hath eares, heare what the Spirit saith to the Churches.* Ergo.

Thus leaving sacred examples, we come to Ecclesiasticall.

First, in regard of those ancient churches, Rome, Alexandria. It is impossible they should bee a Parishionall congregation 200. yeares after Christ. For if the multitude of christians did in Hierusalem so increase within a little time, that they exceeded the proportion of one congregation, how much more likely is it that christians in Rome and Alexandria did so increase in 200. yeares, that they could not keep in one particular Assembly? But the first is true. Ergo, also the latter. Which is yet further confirmed by that which Tertullian and Cornelius testifie of their times.

To come from these to our moderne reformed churches, these prove a Diocesan church. That respect which many congregations distinct may have now assembled in one place, that they may have severed in many places. For the unity of the place is but extrinsicke to the unity of the congregation. But many distinct congregations gathered in one city, may make, wee say, one church, as they doe in the Netherlands. Ergo, distinct congregations, severed in divers places may make one church. If many churches, which may subject themselves to the government of one Presbytery, may so make one, they may subject themselves to a bishop and cathedrall consistory, and so make one. But the 24. churches of *Geneva*, and the territories belonging to it, doe subject themselves to the government of one Presbytery, and so make one. For so farre as two meete in a third, they are one in it. Ergo.

The third principall Argument is from reason. If city churches onely, and not the churches of Villages, and country Townes, had bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons placed in them, then were those city churches Diocesan churches. But city churches onely had these. Ergo, city churches were Diocesan, distinguished from Parishionall churches. The Assumption is proved first by Scripture, Titus 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. Secondly, this is proved by Ecclesiasticall Story. They who are given to labour the conversion of the Regions, rather then tend those already converted, they were not given to a Parishionall church. But the

Presbyters

Presbyters planted by the Apostles were so. Ergo. They who were set in a church before Parishes were, could not be given to a Parishionall church. But such were the Presbyters of the Apostles institution, Ergo. For it is plaine in the practice of all ager, from the first division, that no church but the mother church had a Prebytery and a bishop, but Presbyters onely. Nay, it was ever by councels condemned, and by the judgement of the ancient forbidden, that in Townes or Villages, any but a Presbyter should be planted. 3. This is also proved by reason, for it was no more possible to have bishops and Presbyters in every Parish, then to have a Maior and Aldermen (such as we have in London) in every Towne. 2. If every Parish had a Presbyter, then had they power of ordination, and furnishing themselves with a Minister, when now they were destitute. But they were alwaies in this case dependant on the city. Ergo, there was then a Diocesan church having government of others. Presbyters could not ordaine, *sede vacante*, though they did at first, as in the church of Alexandria. Let any shew for 400. yeares a Parishionall church with a Presbytery in it.

Now we must muster those forces which oppose these Diocesan churches, allowing onely such churches to bee instituted of Christ, which may meet in one congregation ordinarily.

The word which without some modification super-added, doth signifie onely such a company as called forth, may assemble Politically, that word being alone, doth signifie such a church as may to holy purposes ordinarily meete in one. But the word *Church*, which Christ and his Apostles did institute, is used indefinitely, and signifieth no more, Ergo. *Ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum.* 2. The Scripture speaketh of the churches in a Kingdome or Province, alwaies in the plurall number, without any note of difference, as equall one with the other. Ergo, it doth not know Provinciall, Nationall, or Diocesan churches. Let a reason be given, why it should never speake in the singular number, had they beene a singular church.

Secondly, let us come to examples: the churches the Apostles planted were such as might and did congregate.

First, that of Hierusalem, though there were in it toward 500. *Synagogues*, yet the christian church was but one, and such as did congregate into one place ordinarily after the accesse of 5000. to it. Act 2.46. & 5.12. & 6.1. & 15.25. & 21.22. & 25.22. For their ordinary meeting, as it is, Act. 2.46. *daily*, could not be a Panegericall meeting. Againe, if they might meete Synodically, why might they not meete then in daily course; though the universall meeting of a church is not so fitly called Synodicall: And though they

they are said to be millions of beleevers, yet that was by accident of a circumstance, happily the Passeover. We must not judge the greatnesse of a water by that it is, when now it is up and swelleth by accident of some inundations. They had not a setled state there, by which they did get the right of being set members. Yea, it is likely, they were and continued but one congregation. For forty yeeres after they were not so great a multitude, but that *Pella*, like to the *Zebar* of Lot, a little Towne could receive them. But more of this in the answer to the objection.

Secondly, so the Church of Antiochia, was but one Church, Acts 14. 27. they are said to have gathered the Church together. Object. That is, the Ministers, or representative Church. Answ. 1. For Ministers onely, the Church is never used. 2 By analogie, Acts 11. *Peter* gave account before the whole Church, even the Church of the faithfull. *Ergo.* 3. They made relation to that Church, which had sent them forth with prayer and imposition of hands, and this Church stood of all those who assembled to the publike service and worship of God. 4. The people of the Church of Antioch were gathered together to consider of degrees sent them by the Apostles from Hierusalem. τὸ πλῆθος.

Thirdly, the Church of Corinth was one congregation, which did for the service of God, or exercise of Discipline meet together, 1 Cor. 5. 4. 1 Cor. 14. 25. vers. 26. 1 Cor. 11. 17. vers. 23. *in uno & eodem loco.* That whole Church which was guilty of a sinner uncast forth, could not be a Dioceſan Church, neither can the word συνέρχεσθαι *comming together*, ever be shewed to signifie any thing else, besides one particular Assembly.

Fourthly, the Church of Ephesus was but one flocke. First, it is likely that it was of no other forme then the other. Secondly, it was but one flocke; that flocke which Presbyters might jointly feed, was but one. They had no Dioceſan Bishop. If Presbyters onely, then none but Parish onall Churches in and about Ephesus. There may be many flocks, but God ordained none, but such as may wholly meet with those, who have the care of feeding and governing of them. *Peter* indeed, 1 Pet. 5. 2. calleth all those he writeth to, one flocke: but that is in regard either of the mysticall estate of the faithfull, or in respect of the common nature which is in all Churches one and the same: but properly, and in externall adunation, one flocke is but one congregation. Thirdly, Parishes according to the adverse opinion, were not then divided. Neither doth the long and fruitfull labours of the Apostles argue, that there should be Parish Churches in Dioceſan wise added; but a greater number of Sister Churches. But when it is said that all Asia did heare: the

meaning is, that from hand to hand it did runne through Asia, so as Churches were planted every where, even where *Paul* came not, as at Colosse. There might be many churches in Asia, and many converted by *Peter* and others fruitfull labour without subordination of churches.

Examples Ecclesiasticall. 1. *Ignatius* exhorteth the church of the Ephesians, though numberlesse, to meete together often in one place, Epist. to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians: where the Bishop is, let the people be gathered to him, as where Christ is, there is the whole host of heaven. He calleth his church of Antioch a Synagogue of God, which cannot agree to a Diocesan church: For these were particular congregations, opposed as to that Nationall church, so to all Provinciall and Diocesan. Neither doth he call himselfe Bishop of Syria, but as he was, Bishop of the congregation in Syria, as a Minister stileth himselfe a Minister of the church of England.

2 *Justine* and *Irenæus* knew no kinde of church in the world which did not assemble on the Sabboth. But a Diocesan church cannot.

3 *Tertullian* Apol. cap. 39. doth shew that all churches in his time did meet, and did worship God, in which prayers, readings, exhortations, and all manner of censures were performed. Hee knew no churches which had not power of censures within themselves.

4 Churches are said at first to have beene Parishes, and Parishes within cities, in Euseb. lib. 3 44. lib. 4. cap. 21. lib. 2. cap. 6. lib. 4. cap. 25. and Saint *John* lib 3. cap. 23. saith to the Bishop, *redde juvenem quem tibi ego & Christus teste Ecclesia tua tradidimus.* That church in whose presence *John* might commit his *depositum*, or trust, was but one congregation, lib. 4. cap. 11. *Hygenus* and *Pius* are said to have undertaken the Ministery of the church of Rome: which church was such therefore, as they might minister unto, lib 7. 7. *Dionisius Alex.* writeth to *Xistus*, and the church which he governed. A Diocesan church cannnot receive letters. Before *Julian* and *Demetrius* his time, there is no mention of churches in a Bishops parish. The church of Alexandria was within the citie, lib. 7. cap. 2. *Cornelius* is said, *officium Episcopi implevisse in civitate Romæ ex Cyp. lib. 1. epist.* 3. Cornelius *Fœliciss̄imum ex Ecclesia pepulit qui cum tamen de provincia pellare non potuit. Vide Ruffinum, lib. 1. cap. 6. suburbicariarum Ecclesiarum tantum curam gessit. Cyprian* was Pastor *Parœciæ in Carthagine*, of the Parish in Carthage, *Euseb.* lib. 7. cap. 3. *ex verbis Cypriani*, lib. 1. epist. 4.

5 It is the rule of Scripture, that a Bishop should be chosen in sight of his people. Bishops were chosen long after by the people.

As

As of Rome, and others by the people committed to them. Cypr. lib. 4. epist. 1. Neighbour Bishops should come to the people over whom a Bishop was to be set, and chose the Bishop in presence of the people. Schismes were said to be from thence, *Quod Episcopo universa fraternitas non obtemperat, Cypr. epist. 55. tota fraternitas i. unius congregationis tota multitudo, ex qua componitur Ecclesia particularis. Sabino de universæ fraternitatis suffragio Episcopatus fuit delatus.* Cypr. lib. 1. epist. 47. 58. 68. *Ecclesiæ igitur circuitus non fuit major, quàm ut Episcopus totam plebem suam in negotiis hujusmodi convocare potuerit.* Soc. lib. 7. cap. 3. de Agapeto. *Convocavit omnem clerum & populum qui erat intra illius jurisdictionem.*

6 The Chorepiscopi were Bishops in Villages; there is no likelihood of the other notation. Their adversaries in opposing them never object that they were as Delegates, or Suffragan Bishops to them.

7 Bishops were wont to goe forth to confirme all the baptized through the Diocesse.

8 They were neighbours, and might meet a dozen, six, three, in the cause of a Bishop.

9 They were united, sometimes in Provinciall Councels, in which many Bishops met twice yearly, *Ruffin.* lib. 1, cap. 6. *Victor Uticensis* reporteth in a time when they were fewest in Africa in persecution Vandalica, 660. fled to save themselves. *Austin* saith there were innumerable orthodox Bishops in Africa: and the Provinciall Councels doe confirme the same.

Now by reason it is cleare that churches were not Metropolitan or Diocesan.

1 That church whose causes are wanting, that church is wanting. But in a Diocesan church causes are not to be found. *Ergo.*

First, the efficient cause, God ordeyning. For none can take on him to be a minister *Diocesan:* no place to be a place, where the Assembly Diocesan should be held; no people can worship God in repairing to this place and ministery, without warrant of his word. *Ergo.* In the Nationall church of the Jewes, *Aaron* and his sonnes tooke not that honour, it was given them: The place of the Nationall meeting, God chose Hierusalem. The people he precisely bound to practise some ordinances of worship no where but there, and to appeare there before him. Secondly, the matter of a Diocesan church is people within such a circuit, obliged to meet at least on solemne dayes, wheresoever the Diocesan Ministers and Ordinances of worship are exercised; Pastors who have callings to tend them and minister to them in this Diocesan meeting now assembled. Finally, the actuall meetings of them to such end, as such more solemne and publike meetings are ordained to, are no where com-

 manded,

manded, nor in any fashion were ever by any warrant of the Word practised.

If any say, these are not the causes of a Diocesan Church, but an ordinance of God binding persons within such a circuit to subject themselves to such a Church and the ministery thereof, that they may be governed by them.

I answer. First, there is no ordinance of God for this, that can be shewed, that Churches within such a circuit should be tyed to a certaine head Church for government. Nay, it is false. For every Church by Christs institution hath power of government; and the Synagogue had in ordinary matters, the government that the Church of Jerusalem had; (being all over) except onely in some reserved causes. Secondly, I say, that this will not make a Diocesan Church formally so called. As a Nationall Church could not formally be without binding the whole Nation to exercise ordinances of worship in the head Church of it: So by proportion. Yea, government is a thing which doth now *accidere* to a Church constituted, and doth not essentially concurre as matter or forme to constitute a Church of this or that kinde. Againe, were this true, that the Diocesan Pastors and Ministers have onely government committed to them, then it will follow, that they onely have the governing of particular Churches, who are not any way Pastors of them, ministring Word and Sacraments to them. But this is most absurd, that their proper and ordinary Pastors, who dispence Word and Sacraments to them, should not have *potestatem pedi*, nothing to doe in governing those flockes which depend on them. If any say, they were not *actu*, but they were *virtute potentiæ*: I say, it is also to make the Apostles Churches imperfect: and how can this be knowne but by a presumed intention, which hath nothing to shew it, but that after event of things.

From the effect I argue.

2. Those Churches which Christ did ordaine, and the Apostles plant, might ordinarily assemble to the ordinances of worship. But a Diocesan Church cannot ordinarily assemble. *Ergo.* For when God will have mercy and not sacrifice, and the Sabboth is for man, he will not for ever ordaine a thing so unequall and impossible, as is the ordinary assembling of a Diocesan multitude. If any distinguish the assumption, and consider a Diocesan as she is in her parts, or as she is *a totum*, standing of her parts now collected together, and say she may, and doth meet and communicate, and edifie her selfe in the first respect. I answer. This is nothing, and doth prove her to be nothing, as she is a Diocesan Church: *quia quid quid est, agit secundum quod est.* If therefore a Diocesan Church were a reall Church, she must have the effect of such a Church; to wit,

assembling

assembling, as she is Diocesan. The Synagogues through Israel met Sabboth by Sabboth, but were no Nationall Church in this regard; that is to say, as it is a Nationall Church, it had her Nationall reall meetings.

I reason thirdly, from the subject.

3 That Church which doth *per se*, essentially require locall bounds of place, that must have locall limits set forth of God. But a Diocesan Church doth so. *Ergo.* Whence I thus inferre, He who institutes a Diocesan Church, must needs set out the locall bounds of this Church. But God hath not set out any locall bounds of the Church in the New Testament: *Ergo.* He hath not instituted any Diocesan Church. The proposition is certaine: for this doth enter in the definition of a Diocesan Church, as also of a Nationall. And therefore God instituting the Nationall Church of the Jewes, did as in a map set forth the limits of that Nation. So also if he had instituted Diocesan and Provinciall Churches, he would have appointed locall bounds, if not particularly described, yet knowne and certaine. But God hath not done this. For the Church of the New Testament is not thus tied to places; it being so with the power of teaching, and the Ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, that it doth *respicere subditos* onely *per se*, not *terminos locales*. Civill jurisdiction doth *respicere solum* primarily, the subjects on it in the second place. As for that commandement of *appointing Presbyters Citie by Citie*, it is too weake a sparre for this building. Againe, that Church which may be said to be in a Citie, is not Diocesan. But the Churches which the Apostles planted, are said to be in Cities. *Ergo.* If one say to the proposition, they may; because the head Church is in the Citie. *Answer.* The Churches the Apostles planted are taken for the multitude of Saints united into such a body Ecclesiasticall. But the multitude of Saints through a Diocesse cannot be said to be in a Citie. *Ergo.* The soule may be said to be in the head, though it be in other parts; and God in heaven. God, because of his most infinite and indivisible nature: And so the soule, because it is indivisible, and is as all of it in every part, not as a thing placed in a place containing it, but as a forme in that which is informed by it. But in things which have quantity, and are part out of another, there is not the like reason.

4 From the adjuncts. That Church which hath no time set, wherein to assemble, is no Church. I suppose the ground above, that nothing but union of a Diocesse in worship, can make a Diocesan Church. But this Church hath no time. Ordinary it cannot have: extraordinary solemnities God hath not commanded. *Ergo*, there is no such Church. For if it be a reall Diocesan Church, it must have a reall action according to that nature of which it is. The action formall of a Church indefinite is to meet and communicate in worship. Of

a Nationall Church, is to meet nationally and communicate in or diship. If then it must meet, it must have some time set downe, rches, nary or extraordinary, But God hath done neither. The Chu which the Apostles planted, were in their times most perfect and flourishing. But Diocesan Churches were not: for in those times they were but in *seminali* infolded, not explicated, as the adversaries confesse.

4 That which maketh Gods dispensation incongruous to his ministers, is absurd. But a Diocesan frame of Church doth so. *Ergo.* That which maketh God give his extraordinary gifts to ministers of churches in the Apostles times, when now they had but one congregation, and give ordinary gifts onely when now they had 800. churches under them, is absurd. But this doth the Diocesan frame. *Ergo.*

5 The churches throughout which a Presbyter might doe the office of a teaching Presbyter, and a Deacon the office of a Deacon, were not Diocesan. But every Presbyter might minister in the Word and Sacraments throughout the Church to which he was called; so might a Deacon tend to the poore of the whole church, whereof he was a Deacon. *Ergo,* these were not Diocesan. The reason of the proposition is; No Pesbyter can through many congregations performe ordinary ministery. In which regard the Canon law forbiddeth that Presbyters should have many Churches, cap. 10. quæst. 3. *Una plures Ecclesiæ uni nequaquam committantur Pesbytero: quia solus, per Ecclesias nec officium valet persolvere, nec rebus earum necessariam curam impendere.*

6 If God had planted Diocesan churches, that is, ordeined that all within citie, suburbs, and regions, should make but one Diocesan Church, then may not two Dioceses be united into one Church, or another Church and Bishop be set within the circuit of a Diocesan Church. But neither of these are so. The judgement of the African fathers shew the one, and the Canon law doth shew the other, pag. 2. cap. 16. 41. Ergo:

7 If God appointed the frame of the church Diocesan standing of one chiefe church, others united in subjection: then can there not be the perfection of a church in one congregation: But where there may be a sufficient multitude deserving a proper Pastor or Bishop, requiring a number of Presbyters and Deacons to minister unto them, there may be the perfection of a church: But in some one congregation may be such a multitude. *Ergo:*

8 Those churches which may lawfully have Bishops, are such churches as God instituted: But churches in Townes, populous Villages, have had, and may have their Bishops. *Ergo.* This is proved by κατὰ πόλιν every populous Towne, such as our market townes, and others; yea by

a

a *Synecdoche*, villages; for there they taught as well as in Cities. There were Synagogues in Villages, as well as in Cities. They excepted against them afterward in unconformity to Law. The testimony of *Zozomen* sheweth what kinde of congregations were they of which *Epiphanius* testifieth. And the fathers of Africa did not require, that a Diocesan multitude, but a sufficient multitude, not through every part, for then they should have had to doe in Citie churches, but in that part of the Diocesse where a Presbyter only had served the turne, should have their Bishop.

If Diocesan churches, and Provinciall churches be Gods frame, then we had no Churches in Britaine of Gods frame, before that *Austin* was sent by *Gregorie* the great. But here were churches from before *Tertullian*, after the frame God requireth, at least in their judgements. *Ergo.*

Now to come to open the termes, and lay downe conclusions: whether Diocesan or Parishionall Churches were at the first constitute.

First, the word *Church* we understand here, not *figuratively*; taken *Metonymically* for the place, Synedd. for Ministers administring ordinances: but *properly*, for a body politick, standing of people to be taught and governed, and of teachers and governours.

Secondly, it may be asked, What is meant by a Diocesan church? *Answ.* Such a frame in which many Churches are united with one head Church, as partaking in holy things, or at least in that power of government which is in the chiefe Church, for all the other within such, or such a circuit. These phrases of a *Diocesse*, a *Diocesan Bishop*, or *Church*, are all since the time of *Constantine*, yea the two last much later. A Diocesse seemeth from the common-wealth to have beene taken up in the Church, from what time Bishops had Territories, ample demaines, and some degree of civill jurisdiction annexed to them. For a Diocesse by the Lawyers, is a circuit of Provinces, such as the Romans Præsidents had: or *active*, an administration of those Provinces with jurisdiction. *L. unica. c. ut omnes judicet.* And in the Canon law, sometimes *Provincia* and *Diœcesis* are used promiscuously, Dist. 50. cap. 7. But the ancientest use of this word was to note the Territory, or Countrey circuit, opposed to the Citie. Thus the Countrey churches are called *Diœcesanæ Ecclesiæ, contur. cap.* 8.

Thus *Baptismales Ecclesiæ* were contra distinguished to Parishionall. These had every one a Diocesse, and the inhabitants were called *Diœcesani*: these Churches had a moity of houses dwelling in neighbourhood that belonged to them; but at length by a Synecdoche, the whole Church was called a Diocesse; though the Canonists dispute whether it may be so called, seeing the Diocesse is

the

the meaner part by much, in comparison of the Citie, and should not give the denomination to the whole. So at length the Bishop was called *Diœcesanus*, and the Church which had beene called *Ecclesia civitatis, matrix, nutrix, Cathedralis*, grew to be called *Diœcesan*. But here we take a Diocesan Church for such a head Church, with which all Churches in such a circuit hath reall union, and communion in some sacred things. Now a Diocesan Church may be put *objectivè*, that is, for a Church in which are ministers and ministery for the good of the whole Diocesse, though they should never assemble, as the worship in the Church of Jerusalem was for all Judea, and profited, though absent. Or it may be put formally for a body politicke, a congregation of beleevers through a Diocesse, with the ministers of the same, having some reall union and communion in sacred things. We deny any such Church.

A Parishionall Church may be considered *Materially* or *Formally*; Materially, as it is a Church within such locall bounds, the members whereof dwell contiguously one bordering upon the other. This God instituted not, for it is accidentall to the Church, may *abesse* and *adesse*, a Church remaining one. If a Parishionall Church in London should dwell, as the Dutch doe, one farre enough from the other, while the same beleevers were united with the same governours, the Church were not changed, though the place were altered. Secondly, it is put formally, for a multitude which doe in manner of a Parish ordinarily congregate; such Churches, and such onely we say God erected.

Now for some Conclusions, what we agree in, then what severs us.

Conclus. 1. Churches of Cities, Provinces, Kingdomes, may be called Diocesan, Provinciall, Nationall Churches; as the Churches of the world are called Oecumenicall, yea haply not without warrant of Scripture: As 1 Pet. 1. 1. writing to all those dispersed Churches, speaking of them singularly, as of one flocke, 1 Pet. 5. 2. The reason is, things may be called not onely as they are really in themselves, but according to some respect of reason, under which we may apprehend them.

Conclus. 2. That there may be a reall Diocesan, Nationall, or head Church, wherewith others should be bound to communicate more solemnly in Word and Sacraments, and in some more reserved cases concerning their government. This was done in the Church of Judea. Our men are too shie, that feare to come to this proposition, *de posse*. I am sure our adversaries will grant us, that our Parishionall frame might have beene so constituted.

Conclus 3. That there cannot be such a frame of Church, but by Gods institution. No Ministers can take this honour, but they must

(as *Aaron*) be called to it. When nothing in nature can have further degree of perfection, then the author of nature putteth into it; how much more must the degree of perfection and eminence in things Ecclesiasticall, depend on God? We may reason from the Church of Judea, as *à pari*, to prove, That there cannot be such a Church, but that all subordinates must communicate with the chiefest head Church in some sacred things, which may make them one Church. Thus there would not have beene a Church Nationall of the Jewes, but that all the Nation had union and communion together even in the worship and ordinances of worship. The men onely went up, so the male onely were circumcised: but the female representatively went up in them.

Object. It is enough if the communion be in government, which all our opposites grant necessary.

Answ. This maketh then rather one *in tertio quodam separabili*, then one Church: government being a thing that commeth to a Church now constituted, and may be absent, the Church remaining a Church. The first Churches of Bishops, when now they were divided, did keep all other, who were the Bishops presbyters strictly so called, and the people also in some communion with the head Church; for in greater solemnities one and other went up thither. See *decret. dist.* 3. *dist.* 38.

Conclus. 4. We agree in this, that Churches were in their first planting, either not actually Diocesan, being one congregation without any other subordinate, or if they had any, yet were they imperfect, wanting many parts or members of particular Churches, which belonged to them.

That wherein we contradict one another, is, we affirme that no such head Church was ordained either virtually or actually, but that all Churches were singular congregations, equall, independent each of other, in regard of subjection. Secondly, we say, were there a Diocesan granted, yet will it not follow, that Parish churches should be without their government within themselves, but onely subject in some more common and transcendent cases. As it was with the Synagogues and that Nationall Church of the Jewes, and as it is betwixt Provinciall and Diocesan Churches. If any say there is not the same reason of a Diocesan Church and Parishionall: for that hath in it all the perfection of a Church. I answer, not; taken in comparison to a Provinciall Church, it is but a part and member, and hath not perfection, no more then a parochiall Church hath, compared with a Diocesan.

Now followeth to answer the Arguments first proposed.

To the first, I answer to the proposition by distinction. Those who ordained that the *Civitas* and *Urbs* people taken in regard of the

whole multitude of the one, and locall bounds of the other, ſhould make but one Church, they did inſtitute a Dioceſan church. But thoſe who ſo inſtituted a Church in City, Suburbs, Countrey that their number might bee compared fitly to one congregation, they did not therefore ordaine a Dioceſan Church. Againe to the aſſumption. But thoſe who uſe *City by City*, and *Church by Church* as equivalent (which the Apoſtles doe) they ordained that City, Suburbs, and Country ſhould make but one Church. I anſwer by the like diſtinction. They who uſe *City by City*, people being taken for the whole multitude within the extent of theſe locall bounds, as equivalent with *Church by Church*, they may be ſaid to have ordained that city, ſuburbs and territories, ſhould make but one Church. But thus the Apoſtles doe not uſe them, as of equall ſignification. For the City had a reaſon of an ample continent, the Church of a thing contained. Theſe phraſes are, the one proper, the other metonymicall, and are therefore to bee expounded the one by the other. Hee placed Presbyters κατὰ πόλιν, leſt we ſhould underſtand it of the multitude and locall bounds, it is ſaid in the Acts of the Apoſtles that they placed them κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, Church by Church: becauſe Presbyters were not given but to Diſciples and Chriſtians now converted out of the multitude and locall limites wherewith cities were bounded. Secondly, there is an *adequate* acception of theſe phraſes *per accidens*, not becauſe the citie and church was to make but one church, but becauſe the Chriſtians by occaſion of their number, not being then too great, were framed into one church; or becauſe by occaſion there was yet but one church, not becauſe there was to be but one. Now hee who thus uſeth them promiſcuouſly, doth imply that one church was as yet conſtituted, not that there was to be but one through the circuit of city, ſuburbs, and countrey. Thus likewiſe it is eaſily anſwered to the proofe of the propoſition: For thus the multitude of citizens converted and unconverted, could not be a church of one congregation yet the number of thoſe who in city, ſuburbs, and territories, were actually converted, was no more then might be ordered into one church, and the Apoſtles framing theſe into one on the preſent occaſion, did not exclude the after conſtituting of any other within the ſame locall bounds.

To the ſecond Argument: and firſt, the objection from the Nationall church of the Jewes. I anſwer, denying the aſſumption. That the Synagogues being many, made one church; becauſe they were all one Kingdome, one poſſeſſion. For thus there was one Oecumenicall church, when the world was under one Emperour

Emperour, and of one profession. It is accidentall to the unity of a Church whether the kingdome be one or no. If Israel, when God had divided the kingdome into two, had gone up to Hierusalem, and kept there communion in the worship of that Church, they had still been one Church, though two Kingdomes. If here were as many Kings and Kingdomes as have beene in England, so many as should belong to one Provinciall Church, should bee one Church, though many Kingdomes. The truth is, they were one Church, because they had union and Nationall communion in the ordinances of worships, which were in that one Church to which they all belonged. The high Priest was their proper Priest, hee made intercession for them, blessed them, they were not to offer any where, but there. If any thinke this cannot bee the cause, why there were one Church, under the governement of one high Priest, for then should *Aaron* have beene as well as *Melchisideck*, a type of Christs Kingly office. I answer there is *Priestly* Prelacy and governement, as well as *Princely*: They were under *Aaron* in the former regard, in which he was a shadow of Christ.

To the second instance of Hierusalem; we deny the proposition. It might be intended for a head and mother Church in regard of order, and yet not bee a Nationall Church having power over others: If it should have beene a head, having power accordingly, as it was a mother Church, it should have beene head to all the world. Secondly, wee deny the Assumption. That the Apostles ever intended, that it should be a head to Christian Churches through Judea: as it had beene before under the High Priest. That constitution was typicall, and may better plead for an universall Christian Church, then for a Nationall. Secondly, there is not the least intimation of Scripture this way. Thirdly, had this Divinity beene knowne, the Fathers would not have suffered, that it should have beene made a Dioceſan church, and subjected to Cæsarea. To the Prosillogisme. The Church which was so numbersome, that it could not meete ordinarily, could not bee a Parishionall Church. This was so. Ergo, &c. To the proposition I answer, That which was by inhabitants, who had *fixum domicilium*, so numbersome that it could not meete, I grant it. But so this was not; by accident often many others were there *in transitu*. Secondly, nay wee read that they did meete ordinarily, as is above said, and in that deliberation about which the Church of Antioch did send to them, *Irenæus* affirmeth, *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *Universam eam convenisse.*

Luke affirmeth the same. As for that of millions of beleevers, it is certaine, they were not fixed members of this Church. For would *Luke*, who reckoneth the growth of them to five thousand, have concealed so notable accessions, where by they say, they grew up to I know not how many thousands; there is no likelihood. Whether therefore they were such beleevers as are mentioned, *Iohn* 2. or whether by reason of the Passeover, or Penteeost, or such like feast, they were *in transitu*, onely there for the present. However it is, there is no likelihood that they were constant members of that Church, Nevertheless, say, they were more then could fitly meet, yet might they be tollerated as in one Congregation. The Apostles seeing such times to ensue, wherein many of them should translate themselves, and be dispersed hither and thither. God letting it grow a while more ranke and aboundant then ordinary Churches are to be, because it was *Eccleſiæ ſurcularis*, many of whose branches were to be transplanted in their time. Yea, had there beene five thousand setled members, we read of some ordinary Auditories, spoken to by ordinary Pastors, as great; as *Chryſoſtome* on *Matth.* 24. doth signifie, to his esteeme they might be five thousand that then heard his voyce.

Touching the third instance, As to the first reason, The proposition is denyed: for naming the rest of Achaia with them, doth no more signifie the subjection of all Achaians, then in the 1 *Corinth.* 1.2. naming all Saints in every place, doth signifie their subjection. The second reason, hath the sequell of the proposition denied: for the contrary is rather true. He who without any note of difference calleth the church of Corinth by the name of Achaia, he doth imply that it is but one particular church equall with the other churches in Achaia. To the third, the proposition is againe denied, That he that speaketh of all the churches as one, doth imply a metropolitan church. For by the first conclusion we may speake of things not onely as they are really, but according to any respect of reason, under which they are apprehended. Againe, the assumption is false: He speaketh not of them as one church, but as divers churches in one Province. But it is named and set before others. Ergo. &c. The sequell is againe denied. For it may be named before other, because it is the most illustrious and conspicuous church; but not because it hath any power over other. Finally, it is too grosse to thinke, that all in Achaia came to Corinth to be instructed and make their contributions, every church using the first day of the weeke when they assembled to make their collections within themselves.

The fourth instance is *Crete*; where the many churches in that Iland, so full of cities, are said to be one church of Crete, whereof *Titus* was Bishop. Those manifold churches which made but one, whereof *Titus* was Bishop, those were all one Nationall church. But the churches of Crete, as saith the subscription, were so. Ergo. Answ. The proposition might be questioned on the ground above: but the assumption is false: proved by a subscription, which is like his proofe, which was brought out of the booke after the Revelation. For first they are not in the Syriacke testament. Secondly, they are nor thought of Antiquity ancienter then Theodoret. Thirdly, the subscription is false, and most unlikely: For had Paul written from Nicopolis, he would have wished Titus to come to him to Nicopolis, where he was for the present, and meant to winter, rather then have spoken of it as a place from which he was absent, and whether he meant to repaire.

The fifth instance. Phillip. 3. That church, which was in the chiefe citie of Macedonia, must needs be at least a Diocesan. But the church of Philippi was so. Ergo. This will prove an argument, when churches must needs be conformed to the civill regency of the Emperour: his foure chiefe Governours called *præfecti prætorii*, his presidents of Provinces under them, and inferiour Judges, and Magistrates, under these in one citie, and the regions of it. But this is an errour giving ground to a Patriarchall and Oecumenicall church, as well as a Provinciall and Diocesan. This rule of planting churches varieth at mans pleasure: For the Romane Provinces after the people of Rome gave up their right to the Emperour, were brought all into one, under one head and Monarch, and Provinces have beene diversly divided from time to time. From this Monarchie arose the Popes plea against the Greeke churches for his Oecumenicall soveraignty. What forme of churches must we have amongst them who never received any such government, nay any constant government at all. If I were a conformitant I should object otherwise for a Provinciall church in Philippi: viz thus. That church which had many Bishops in it could not be Parishionall nor Diocesan, but Provinciall. For the Provinciall church hath the Metropolitan and Suffragan Bishops in it, and no other. But Philippi had so. Ergo. But the Proposition is true onely when it is understood of Diocesan Bishops, not of Parishionall Bishops. Paul writeth not to the Bishops in the church, but in the citie: Now many Bishops are not in the Provinciall citie, though many are in a Provinciall church.

Now to come to the churches of Asia. I answer to the proposition of the first Syllog. by distinction. One church may conteine others, as an example doth conteine in it a thing exemplified: or

as a head Church doth Churches united in subjection to it. Those Churches which conteine all other in the latter sence, it is true, they were at least Diocesan : but in this sense the assumption is denyed. The same answer fitteth the Prosyllog. He that writing to these, writeth to all other by vertue of their subjectionall subordination, he doth imply that all others are conteined in these as member Churches under one head. But he who writing to these, writeth to all other as exemplified onely in them, he doth not imply any such thing. Now this is manifest, because he writeth to seven Churches : whereas this were superfluous, if Christ did intend his letter onely to head Churches conteyning other. For then five Churches should have beene written to onely, seeing in them all others were conteyned, as they say. For by law of this virtuall continency, Philadelphia and Thiatira were included in two of the other, viz. Sardis, and Pergamus, which were their mother cities. What needed he have named Philadelphia and Thyatira, which by law of this virtuall continency did intend to direct his letter onely to head Churches? Againe, the assumption is false : For he doth write principally to the seven, and to all other Churches in Asia no further then he writeth to all the Churches in the world. There were other Churches in Asia, such as were Colosse, Hierapolis, Troas, the Church at Miletum, and Assos, which the Centuries mention, which depended not on those seven. If Colosse and Hierapolis were not, as Laodicæa, reedified when John did write the Revelation, yet these other Churches were not extant. Not to name Magnesia and Tralles, the independancy whereof is fully cleared whatsoever Doct. Downam objecteth.

To the third reason ; from Christs manner of concluding his Epistles, it is answered by denying the assumption. For Christ doth not use the plurall number in respect of that one Church preceding, but in respect of the seven collectively taken, it being his will that the members of each singular Church should lay to heart both severally and joyntly, what ever was spoken to them and to others.

Now to come to the Ecclesiasticall examples, as of Rome, and Alexandria, two hundred yeares after Christ. And first to answer the reason brought for their increase, such as could not keepe still in a Parishionall meeting. The proposition is not of necessary consequence ; for there were very extraordinary reasons of that which was effected in the Church of Jerusalem : From Christ himselfe, from the residence of all the Apostles ; from the state of the people there assembled ; from the state of that Church ; from the time in which these were done. Christ had

had prayed for them particularly, to which some attribute the first miraculous conversion by Peters preaching. Againe, it was fit, that being now ascended into his glory, he should there more aboundantly display his power, and more conspicuously swallow up the scandall of his crosse. Againe, this Church had the labour of all the Apostles for a time in it: whose care and industry we may gueſſe by their ordination of Deacons, that they might not be distracted. Thirdly, the confluence and concourse to Hierusalem was of much people, who though explicately they did not beleeve in Christ; yet had in them the faith of the Messiah, and therefore were neerer to the kingdome of God then the common Heathen. The state of this Church was such, that it was to send out light to all other, a common nursery to the world. Finally, the time being now, the beginnings of planting that heavenly Kingdome, seeing beginnings of things are difficult, no wonder if the Lord did reveale his arme more extraordinarily. It doth not therefore follow from this particular, to the so great encreasing of these churches in tract of time. Nay, if these other Churches had enjoyed like increase in their beginnings, it would not follow, as thus. *Those Churches which within a few yeares had thus many in them, how numberſome were they many yeares after?* Because the growing of things hath a Period set, after which, even those things which a great while encreased, doe decrease and goe downward, as it was in Jerusalem. Not to mention, that we deny the assumption.

But though the Argument is but Topicall, and can but breed an opinion onely, yet the testimonies seeme irrefragable. Tertullian testifying that halfe the Citizens in Rome was Christians. And Cornelius, that there was besides himselfe, and 45. Presbyters, a numberſome Clergie.

I answer, That Tertullians speech seemeth to be somewhat Hyperbolicall: for who can beleeve that more then halfe the Citie, and world, after a sort, were Christians? But he speaketh this, and truely in some regard, because they were so potent through the world, that if they would have made head they might have troubled happily their persecutors. Or else he might say they were halfe of them Christians, not because there were so many members of the Church: but because there were so many who did beare some favour to their cause, and were it as safe as otherwise, would not sticke to turne to them. But Tertullian knew no Churches which did not meet, having prayers, exhortations, and ministering all kindes of censures: If therefore there were more Churches in Rome in his time, it will make little for Dioceſan Churches.

Touching

Touching *Cornelius*: we answer, It is not unlike but auditeries were divided and tended by Presbyteries. *Cornelius* keeping the Cathedrall Church, and being sole Bishop of them: but we deny that these made a Diocesan Church. For first, the Cathedrall and Parochiall Churches were all within the Citie, in which regard he is said, *Officium Episcopi impleviſſe in civitate Rome.* Neither was his Church as ample as the Province, which that of Fœliciſſimus ſufficiently teacheth. Secondly, we ſay that theſe Parochiall churches, were to the mother church, as chappels of eaſe are to theſe churches *in metrocomiis*, they had communion with the mother church, going to the ſame for Sacraments and hearing the Word, and the Biſhop did goe out to them and preach amongſt them. For ſome of them were not ſuch as had liberty of Baptizing, and therefore could not be ſevered from communion with the head Church.

Now to anſwer further, it is beyond 200. yeares for which our defence is taken. For there is reaſon why people which had beene held together for 200. yeares as a Congregation, might now fifty yeares after be exceedingly encreaſed. The Eccleſiaſticall ſtory noteth a moſt remarkeable increaſe of the faith, now in the time of *Julian* before *Cornelius*. Neither muſt we thinke that an Emperour, as *Philippus*, favouring the faith, did not bring on multitudes to the like profeſſion. Secondly, we ſay, there is nothing in this of *Cornelius* which may not well ſtand, that the Church of Rome, though now much increaſed, did not keepe together as one Church. For the whole people are ſaid to have prayed and communicated with the repentant Biſhop, who had ordeyned *Novatus*: and we ſee how *Cornelius* doth amplifie *Novatus* his pertinacie: From hence, that none of the numerous Clergie, nor yet of the people, very great and innumerable, could turne him, or recall him, which argueth that the Church was not ſo aboundant, but that all the members of it had union and communion, for the mutuall edifying and reſtoring one of another. And I would faine know, whether the ſeven Deacons, ſeven Subdeacons, two and forty Acolouthes, whether thoſe exorciſtes, Lectors, Porters about two and fifty are ſo many, as might not be taken up in a Congregation of fifteene or twenty thouſand? Surely the time might well require them, when many were to be ſent forth to doe ſome part of miniſtery more privately. Not to name the errour of the Church in ſuperfluous multiplications of their Presbyters, to vilifying of them, as they were ſuperfluous in the point of their Deacons. There were ſixty in the church of Sophia for the helpe of the Liturgie. True it is, the Congregation could not but be exceeding great, and might well be called in a manner innumerable, though it were but of a twenty thouſand people. But becauſe of that which is reported touching diviſion by *Evariſtus*, *Hyginus*, *Dionyſius*, and *Marcellinus*;

Marcellinus, though there is no authenticke authour for it; neither is it likely in Hospinianus judgement. Let it be yeelded that there were some Parochiall divisions, they were not many, and within the Citie, and were but as Chappels of ease to the cathedrall or mother Church.

Concerning the objection from the Churches of Belgia, or the low Countries, we deny the proposition: for we cannot reason thus: *If many Masters, and distinct formes of Schollers, in one free Schoole, be but one Schoole: then many Masters and company of Schollers, severed in many Schooles, are but one Schoole.* Secondly, they have communion in the community of their Teachers, though not in the same individuall word tended by them. But it is one thing, when sheepe feed together in one common Pasture, though they bite not on the same individuall grasse: Another thing when now they are tended in diverse sheepe-gates. Not to urge, that in the Sacraments and Discipline, they may communicate as one Congregation.

Touching the objection from Geneva: I answer to the proposition by distinction. *Those who subject themselves to a Presbyterie, as not having power of governing themselves within themselves, as being under it by subordination, these may in effect, as well be subject to a Consistorie: But thus the twenty foure Churches of Genevæ doe not.* They or have power of governing themselves, but for greater edification, voluntarily confederate, not to use nor exercise their power, but with mutuall communication, one asking the counsell and consent of the other in that common Presbytery. Secondly, it is one thing, for Churches to subject themselves to a Bishop and Consistory, wherein they shall have no power of suffrage: Another thing to communicate with such a Presbytery, wherein themselves are members and Judges with others. Thirdly, say, they had no power, nor were no members in that Presbytery, yet it is one thing to submit themselves to the government of Aristocrasie, another to the Bishops Monarchicall government. For while his Presbyters are but as Counsellours to a King, though he consulteth with them, he alone governeth. Geneva made this consociation, not as if the Prime Churches were imperfect, and to make one Church by this union: but because though they were intire Churches, and had the power of Churches, yet they needed this support in exercising of it, and that by this meanes the Ministers and Seniors of it might have communion. But what are all the foure and twenty Churches of Geneva to one of our Diocesan Churches?

Now to answer the reasons. The first of them hath no part true: the proposition is denyed. For these Churches which had such Presbyters and Deacons as the Apostles instituted were Parishionall, that is, so conjoyned that they might and did meet in one Congregation.

The Doctor did consider the slenderness of some of our Parishes, and the numbersome Clergy of some Cathedrall Churches, but did not consider there may be Presbyteries much lesser, and Congregations ampler and fuller, and yet none so bigge as should require that multitude he imagineth, nor made so little as might not have Presbyters and Deacons. What though such Maior and Aldermen as are in London cannot be had in every Towne, yet such a Towne as Cambridge may have a Maior and Aldermen as Cambridge affoords, and the meanest market Towne may have, though not in degree, yet in kinde like Governours. So is it in Presbyters and other Officers: the multitude of Presbyters falling forth *per accidens*, not that a Bishop is ever to have a like numbersome Presbyterie, but because the Church is so numbersome that actions liturgicall require more copious assistance, and so wealthy that it can well maintaine them. And beside, because of that Collegiate reason which was in them rather then Ecclesiasticall, which the fathers had in their Presbyteries; for the nursing of plants, which might be transplanted for supply of vacant Churches, which was a point that the Apostles in planting Churches no whit intended.

To come to the assumption: *But city Churches onely had a Bishop with Presbyters and Deacons.* Answer, First, not to stand upon this, that Saint *Paul* set no Bishops with Presbyters, but Presbyters onely, and they say Bishops were given, when the Presbyters had brought the Church to bee more numbersome, the assumption is false, that *Citie Churches onely had them.* For the Scripture saith, they planted them Church by Church, that is, through every Church. Then every Church had her Governours within her selfe, wee must use as ample interpretations as may be. Contrarily, the sense which arrogateth this to one from the rest wee cannot without evidence receive it, *in ambitiosis restricta interpretatio adhibenda est. Ecclesia* doth not signifie any Church without difference, Parishionall, Dioceſan, or Provinciall; but onely a company orderly assembling, not ἀφεϛὼ but ἐκκλησία νομιμὴ ϗ ὡϊσμένη. Such a company therefore as congregate decently to sacred purposes is a Church by translation. Besides the indefinite is equivalent to the universall, as, καϑ' ἑκάϛην πόλιν, so κατ' ἐκκλησίαν is καϑ' ἑκάϛην ἐκκλησίαν. Now their interpretation beggeth every thing without any ground. For when Presbyters may be taken but three waies: *divisim, conjunctim*, and *divisim*, and *conjunctim: divisim* one Presbyter in one, another in another, *conjunctim*, diverse Presbyters in every Church, neither of these will serve their turne, the latter onely being true: for Scripture making two kinds of Presbyters, without which the Church cannot be governed, it is sure it did give of both kinds to every Church they planted,

ted. Now they seeing some Churches in our times to have many, and some one conster it both waies *Collective*, many Presbyters, & *Singularly*, one here, and one there, and because many Presbyters cannot be thus placed in our frame of Churches, imagine the Church to containe Parochiall and Diocesan Churches.

But they will not seeme to speake without reason; the Scripture say they placed City by City Presbyters, and therefore in such Churches as occupied Citie, Suburbes, and Countrey, which Parishionall ones doe not. But may not a Church of one Congregation be in a Citie, without occupying limits of Citie, Suburbes, and Countrey? and if Presbyters be placed in such a Church, may they not bee said to be placed in Cities? Indeed if the Presbyters placed in Cities were given to all the people within such bounds; the case were other; but the citie is not literally thus to be understood, but metonymically for the Church in the Citie. Neither was the Church in the city, all within such bounds; for the Saints of a place and Church of a place, are all one in the Apostles phrase of speech. As for that which is objected from Ecclesiasticall history, it is true, that in processe of time, the *Bishop* onely had a company of Presbyters. Before, Churches kept in one Congregation and had all their Presbyters. Churches should so have afterward beene divided, that all should have beene alike for kinde, though in circumstantiall excellency some were before other. What a grosse thing is it to imagine, that the first frame the Apostles did erect was not for posterity to imitate? A fitter example then to take out of the custome of *Metropoles*, who sending out there *Σποικίας*, or *Colonies*, doe use to reserve some cases in civill jurisdiction over them, which the state of later Churches did expresse.

THE SECOND QVESTION, WHETHER *CHRIST* ORDAINED by himselfe, or by his Apostles, any ordinary Pastor, as our Bishops, having both precedency of order, and majority of power above others.

WEE will follow the same method: First, setting downe the arguments for it, with answers to them: Secondly, the arguments against it. Thirdly, lay downe conclusions. The arguments for it are: First, taken from Scripture: secondly, from practise of the Churches: thirdly, from reason evincing the necessity of it.

The first Argument.

Those whom the holy Ghost instituted, they are of Christs ordaining. But the holy Ghost is said to have placed Bishops, Acts 20. Ergo, Bishops are of Christs ordaining.

Answer. We deny the assumption: viz. That those Presbyters of Ephesus were Diocesan Bishops. It is most plaine they were such who did *Communi consilio* tend the feeding and government of the Church; such Bishops whereof there might be more then one in one congregation. The common glosse referreth to this place that of *Jerom*: that at first Presbyters did by common councell governe the Churches. Yea, Doct. *Downam* doth count Ephesus as yet to have had no Bishop, who was sent unto them after *Pauls* being at Rome, as he thinketh. And others defending the Hierarchie, who thinke him to have spoken to Bishops, doe judge that these words belong not to the Presbyters of Ephesus, but are spoken in regard of others together then present with them, to wit, of *Timothy*, *Sosipater*, *Tychicus*, who, say

say they, were three Bishops indeed; but that he speaketh of these who indeed were in company, is quite besides the text.

The second Argument:

Such Pastors as the seven Angels, Christ ordained. But such were Diocesan Bishops. Ergo. The assumption proved. Those who were of singular prehemineney amongst other Pastors, and had corrective power over all others in their Churches, they were Diocesan bishops. But the Angels were singular persons in every Church, having Ecclesiasticall prehemineence and superiority of power. Ergo, they were Diocesan bishops. The assumption is proved. Those who were shadowed by seven singular Starres, were seven singular persons. But the Angels were so. Ergo. Againe, Those to whom onely Christ did write, who onely bare the praise, dispraise, threatning, in regard of what was in the Church amisse, or otherwise: they had Majority of power above others. But these Angels are written to onely, they are onely praised, dispraised, threatned. Ergo. &c.

Answ. 1. In the two first syllogismes the assumption is denyed. Secondly, in the first Prosyllogisme the consequence of the propositiion is denied, That they must needs be seven singular persons. For seven singular starres may signifie seven Vnites, whether singular or aggregative: seven pluralities of persons who are so united as if they were one. And it is frequent in Scripture to note by a unity, a united multitude. Thirdly, the consequence of the proposition of the last prosyllogisme is denyed. For though we should suppose singular persons written to, yet a prehemineney in order and greater authority, without majority of power, is reason enough why they should be written to singularly, and blamed, or praised above other. Thus the Master of a Colledge, though he have no negative voyce, might be written to, and blamed for the misdemeanours of his Colledge, not that he hath a power over-ruling all: but because such is his dignity, that did he doe his endeavour in dealing with, and perswading others, there is no disorder which he might not see redressed. Fourthly, againe the assumption may be denyed: That they are onely written to. For though they are onely named, yet the whole Churches are written to in them; the supereminent member of the Church by a Synecdoche put for the whole Church. For it was the custome in the Apostles times, and long after, that not any singular persons, but the whole Churches were written unto, as in *Pauls* Epistles is manifest, and in many examples Ecclesiasticall. And that this was done by Christ here, the Epiphonemaes testifie. *Let every one heare what the Spirit speaketh to the Churches.*

The third Argument.

Those whom the Apostles ordained, were of Apostolicall institu-

on. But they ordained Bishops. Ergo. The assumption is proved by induction.

First, they ordained *James* Bishop of Jerusalem presently after Christs ascention. Ergo. they ordained Bishops. This is testified by *Eusebius, lib. 2. Histo. cap. 1.* out of *Clement* and *Hegesippus* : yea, that the Church he sate in was reserved to his time, *lib. 7. cap. 19. & 32.* This our owne author *Ierom testifieth, Catalog. Script. Epiph. ad hær. 66. Chrysost. in Act. 3. & 33. Ambros. in Galath. 1. 9. Dorotheus in Synopsis. Aug. contra Cres. lib. 2. cap. 37.* the generall Councell of Const. in Trull. cap. 32. For though hee could not receive power of order, yet they might give him power of jurisdiction, and assigne him his Church. So that though he were an Apostle, yet having a singular assignation, and staying here till death, he might justly be called the Bishop, as indeed he was. If he were not the Pastor, whom had they for their Pastor ?

Secondly, those ordinary Pastors who were called Apostles of Churches in comparison of other Bishops and Presbyters ; they were in order and majority of power before other. But *Epaphroditus* was the Apostle of the Philippians, though they had other called Bishops. Chap. 1. 4 Ergo. The assumption ; that he is so called as their eminent Pastor, is manifest by authorities. *Ierom. in Phil. 2. Theod. and Chrysost.* on the same place. Neither is it like this sacred appropriate name should bee given to any in regard of meere sending hither or thither. Yea this, *that he was sent*, did argue him there Bishop : for when the Churches had to send any where they did usually intreate their Bishops.

Thirdly, *Archippus* they instituted at Colosse. Ergo.

Fourthly, *Timothy* and *Titus* were instituted Bishops, the one of Ephesus, the other of Crete. Ergo. The Antecedent is proved thus. That which is presupposed in their Epistles, is true. But it is presupposed that they were Bishops in these Churches. Ergo. The assumption proved. Those whom the Epistles presuppose to have had Episcopall authority given them to bee exercised in those Churches, they are presupposed to have beene ordained bishops there. But the Epistles presuppose them to have had Episcopall authority given them to be exercised in those Churches. Ergo. The assumption proved. 1. If the Epistles written to *Timothy* and *Titus*, bee patternes of the Episcopall function, informing them, and in them all bishops, then they were bishops. But they are so. Ergo. 2 Againe, whosoever prescribing to *Timothy* and *Titus* their duties as governours in these Churches, doth prescribe the very dutie of bishops, hee doth presuppose them bishops. But *Paul* doth so : For what is the office of a bishop beside teaching, but to ordaine and governe : and governe with singularitie

gularity of preheminence, and majority of power in comparison of other. Now these are the things which they have in charge, *Tit.* 1. 5. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. 11. 2 *Tim.* 2. 16. Ergo. 3. Those things which were written to informe not onely *Timothy* and *Titus*, but in them all their successours who were Diocesan Bishops, those were written to Diocesan bishops. But these were so. Ergo, to Diocesan bishops. Now that Diocesan bishops were their successours, is proved. 1. Either they, or Presbyters, or Congregations. Not the latter. 2. Againe, Those who did succeed them were their successours. But Diocesan bishops did. Ergo. The assumption is manifest by authorities. In Ephesus from *Timothy* to *Stephanus* in the Counsell of Chalcedon. And in Crete, though no one is read to have succeeded, yet there were bishops Diocesan. And we read of *Phillip* bishop of Gortina the Metropolis. 4. Those who were ordinarily resident, and lived and died at these Churches, were there bishops. But *Timothy* was bid abide here, *Titus* to stay to correct all things, and they lived and died here. For *Timothy* it is testified by *Hegisippus*, and *Clement* and *Eusebius* out of them, whom so refuse to believe, deserve themselves no beliefe. Ergo, they were there bishops. Againe, Jerom. in Cat. Isidorus de vita & morte Sanct. Antonius par. 1. Tit. 6. cap. 28. Niceph. lib. 10. Cap. 11. these doe depose, that they lived and died there. Further, to prove them bishops. 5. Their function was Evangelicall and extraordinary, or ordinary; not the first, that was to end. For their function as assigned to these Churches, and consisting especially in ordaining and jurisdiction, was not to end. Ergo. Assumption proved. That function which was necessary to the being of the Church, was not to end. But the function of thy had as being assigned to certaine Churches, is necessary to the being of the Church, Ergo, &c. 6. Finally, that Antiquity testifieth, agreeing with Scripture, is true. But they testifie that they were bishops, which the subscriptions of the Epistles also affirme. Ergo. Eusebius Lib. 5. Cap. 4. Dyonis. Areopag. Doroth. in Synopsi. Ambrose præm. in 1. Tim. 1. Jerom. 1. Tim. 1. 14. 2. Tim. 4. in Catalo. Chrysostom. in Philip. 1. Epiph. in Hær. 5 Primas. prefat. in 1. Tim, 1. 1. Theod. præfat. in Tit. Oecum. Sedulius. 1. Timoth. 1. as it is said in the booke of histories. Greg. Lib. 2. Cap. 12. Theoph. in Ephes. 4. Niceph. lib. 2. Cap. 34.

Answer.

We deny the assumption of the first Syllogisme, with all the instances brought to prove it.

First, for *Iames*, we deny he was ordained bishop, or that it can be proved from antiquity, that he was more then other Apostles. That which *Eusebius* reporteth, is grounded on *Clement*, whom wee know to be a forged magnifier of Romish orders, and in this story he doth

seeme

seeme to imply, that Christ should have ordeyned *Peter*, *John* and *James* the greater Bishops. Seeing he maketh these to have ordeyned *James* after they had got of Christ the supreme degree of dignity, which these forged deceitfull Epistles of Anacletus doe plainely affirme. Secondly, as the ground is suspected; so the phrase of the Fathers, *Calling him the Bishop of that Church*, doth not imply that he was a Bishop properly so called. The Fathers use the words of *Apostoli* and *Episcopi* amply, not in their strict and formall propriety. *Ierom* on the first to the Galathians, and in his Epistle to *Damasus*, affirmeth, that the *Prophets* and *John* the Bishop might be called Apostles. So many Fathers call *Phillip* an Apostle. *Clem. 5. Const. cap. 7. Euseb. lib. 3. cap. ult. Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 8.* and others. In like manner they call the Apostles Bishops; not in propriety of speech, but because they did such things as Bishops doe, and in remaining here or there made resemblance of them. Thus *Peter*, *Paul*, *John*, *Barnabas*, and all the rest, are by the Ancients called Bishops.

Object. This is granted true, touching others, but not in this instance of *Iames*: because it is so likely and agreeable to Scripture, as well as all other Story; that when all the rest of the Apostles departed out of Jerusalem, *John* the Baptist did still abide with them even to death. Answer. Though this be but very conjecturall, yet it nothing bettereth the cause here. It followeth not, He did abide with this Church. Ergo, he was the proper Bishop of this Church. For not abiding in one Church doth make a Bishop: but he must so abide in it, that he must from the power of his office, onely be bound to teach that Church: secondly, to teach it as an ordinary Pastor of it: thirdly, to governe it with a power of jurisdiction, limited onely to that Church. But *Iames* was bound to the rest of the Circumcision by his office, as they should from all the world resort thither. Secondly, he did not teach but as an Embassadour extraordinarily sent from Christ, and infallibly led by his Spirit into all truth. Ergo, not as an ordinary Bishop. Thirdly, as the rest in what Provinces soever they rested, had not their jurisdiction diminished, but had power occasionally, as well where they were not, as where they were; so it was with *Iames*. This might happily make the phrase to be more founded out of *Iames*, that he did in this circumstance of residing, more neerely expresse an ordinary Pastor then any other. It is plaine, Antiquity did hold them all Bishops, and gather them so to be, *a Priori & Posteriori*: the Author *de quæst. vet. & nov. test. cap. 97. Nemo ignorat Episcopos salvatorem Ecclesiis instituisse priusquam ascenderet: imponens manus Apostolis, ordinavit eos in Episcopus.* Neither did they thinke them Bishops because they received a limited jurisdiction of any Church; but because they were enabled to doe all those things which none but Bishops could

regularly

regularly doe. *Oecum. cap. 22. in Act.* It is to bee noted, saith hee, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* had the dignity of Bishops: for they did not make Bishops onely, but Presbyters also. Now wee must confesse the ancient, as taking them onely eminently and virtually to have been Bishops, or else wee must judge them to have been of this minde, That the Apostles had both as extraordinarie Legats, most ample power of teaching and governing suting thereto, as also the ordinary office of Bishops and Pastors, with power of teaching and governing, such as doe essentially and ministerially agree to them: which indeed Doctor *Downam* himselfe confuteth, as Popish, and not without reason, though while hee doth strive to have *Iames* both an Apostle and a Bishop properly, himselfe doth confirme it not a little.

Wherefore it will not be unprofitable to shew some reasons why the Apostles neither were nor might be in both these callings.

First, That which might make us doubt of all their teaching, and writing, is to bee hissed forth as a most dangerous assertion. But to make *Iames*, and so any of them, have both these offices in proprietie, might make us doubt. Ergo. The assumption proved thus. That which doth set them in office of teaching liable to errour, when they teach from one office, as well as infallibly directed with a rule of infallible discerning, when they teach from the other, that doth make us subject to doubting in all they teach and write. But this opinion doth so. Ergo. The proposition is, for ought I see, of necessarie truth, the assumption no lesse true. For if there bee any rule to direct *James* infallibly, as hee was formally the ordinary bishop of Jerusalem, let us heare it: if there were none, may not I question, whether all his teaching and writing were not subject to errour? For if hee taught them as an ordinarie bishop, and did write his Epistle so, then certainly it might erre. If he did not teach them so, then did hee not that hee was ordained to, neither was hee properly an ordinary Pastor, but taught as an extraordinarie Embassadour from Christ.

Secondly, Those offices which cannot bee exercised by one, but the one must expell the other, were never by God conjoyned in one person. But these doe so. Ergo. The assumption is manifest. Because it is plaine, none can be called to teach as a Legat extraordinarie, with infallible assistance, and unlimited jurisdiction, but he is made uncapable of being bound to one Church, teaching as an ordinary person, with jurisdiction limited to that one Church. Againe, one can no sooner bee called to doe this, but at least the exercise of the other is suspended. Thirdly, that which is to no end, is not to bee thought to bee ordained of God. But to give one an ordinarie authority, whereby to doe this or that in a Church, who

had a higher and more excellent power of office, whereby to doe those same things in the same Church, is to no end. Ergo.

Object. But it will be denied that any other power of order, or to teach and administer sacraments was given, then that he had as an Apostle: but onely jurisdiction or right to this Church as his Church.

Answer. To this I reply, first, that if hee had no new power of order, he could not be an ordinary Bishop properly and formally so called. Secondly, I say power of governing ordinary was not needfull for him who had power as an Apostle in any Church where hee should come. *Object.* But it was not in vaine, that by assignation hee should have right to reside in this Church as his Church. *Answer.* If by the mutuall agreement in which they were guided by the spirit, it was thought meete, that *James* should abide in Jerusalem, there tending both the Church of the Jewes, and the whole circumcision, as they by occasion resorted thither, then by vertue of his Apostleship hee had no lesse right to tend those of the circumcision by residing here, then the other had right to doe the same in the Provinces through which they walked. But they did thinke it meete that hee should there tend that Church, and with that Church all the Circumcision, as they occasionally resorted thereto. Ergo. For though hee was assigned to reside there, yet his Apostolicke Pastorall care was as *Johns* and *Peters*, towards the whole multitude of the dispersed Jewes, Galath. 2. Now if it were assigned to him for his abode, as hee was an Apostolicke Pastor, what did hee need assignation under any other title. Nay he could not have it otherwise assigned, unlesse wee make him to sustaine another person, viz. of an ordinary Pastor, which hee could not bee who did receive no such power of order as ordinary Pastors have.

Fourthly, that calling which hee could not exercise without being much abased, that hee never was ordained unto, as a point of honour for him. But he could not exercise the calling of an ordinary Bishop, but hee must bee abased. Hee must bee bound by office to meddle with authority and jurisdiction but in one Church, hee must teach as an ordinary man liable to errour. Ergo, hee was never ordained to bee a Bishop properly. If it bee sacriledge to reduce a Bishop to the degree of a Presbyter, what is it to bring an Apostle to the degree of a Bishop? True it is, hee might have beene assigned to reside constantly in that Church without travelling, and be no whit abased: but then he must keepe there a Pastor of it with Apostolicall authority, caring not for that Church, but the whole number of the Jewes, which hee might doe without travelling. Because

cause who so keeped in that Church, hee did neede to goe forth as the rest; for the Jewes from all parts come to him. But he could not make his abide in it as an ordinary teacher and governour, without becomming many degrees lower then hee was. For to live without going forth, in the mother Church of all the world, as an ordinary Pastor, was much lesse honour then to travaile as *peter* one while into Assyria, another while through Pontus, Galatia, Bithinia, as an Apostle. Even as to sit at home in worshipfull private place is lesse honourable then to goe abroad as Lord Embassadour hither or thither. Honour and ease are seldome bedfellowes. Neither was *James* his honour in this circumstance of the rest, but in having such an honourable place wherein to exercise his Apostolicke calling. As for that question, who was their ordinary Pastor, it is easily answered. Their Presbyters, such as *Linus*, or *Clemens* in Rome, such as Ephesus and other Churches had. *Iames* was their Pastor also, but with extraordinary authority. What needed they an ordinary Bishop, which grew needfull (as the favourers of the Hierarchy say) to supply the absence of Apostles, when now they were to decease? What needed then here an ordinary Bishop where the Apostles were joyntly to keepe twelve yeares together, and one to reside during his life, according to the current of the story? Thus much about the first instance.

To the second instance of *Epaphroditus*, and the argument drawen from it. First, we deny the proposition. For had some ordinary Pastors beene so stiled, it might imply but a preheminencie of dignity in them above other: wherefore unlesse this be interserted, it is unsound, viz: *Those ordinary Pastors, who are called Apostles in comparison of others, because the Apostles did give to them power of ordination, jurisdiction, and peereleſſe preheminency, which they did not give to others, they are above others.* Secondly, the Assumption is false altogether: First, that *Epaphroditus* was an ordinary Pastor: Secondly, that hee was called an Apostle in comparison of inferiour Pastors of that Church. *Obi.* But the judgement of *Ierom, Theodoret, Chrysostome*, is that he was. *Answ.* The common judgement is, that he was an egregious teacher of theirs, but further then this, many of the testimonies doe not depose. Now so he might be: for he was an Evangelist, and one who had visited and laboured among them, and therefore might be called their teacher, yea an egregious teacher, or Doctor of them. Nay, Saint *Ambrose* doth plainely insinuate, that he was an Evangelist: for he saith he was made their Apostle by the Apostle, while he sent him to exhort them, and because he was a good man, he was desired of the people. Where hee maketh him sent, not for perpetuall residence amongst them, but for the *transient* exhorting of them, and maketh him so desired of the

Philippians, because hee was a good man, not because hee was their ordinary Pastor. *Ieroms* testimony on this place doth not evince. For the name of Apostles and Doctors is largely taken, and as appliable to one, who as an Evangelist did instruct them, as to any other. *Theod.* doth plainly take him to have been as their ordinarie bishop, but no otherwise then *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Evangelists are said to have been b shops: which how true it is, in the next argument shall bee discussed. For even *Theodoret* doth take him to have beene such an Apostolicke person as *Timothy* and *Titus* were. Now these were as truly called bishops as the Apostles themselves. Neither is the rule of *Theodoret* to bee admitted: for it is unlike that the name of Apostle should bee communicated then with ordinarie Pastors, where now there was danger of confounding those eminent Ministers of Christ, with others, and when now the Apostles were deceased, that then it should cease to bee ascribed to them. Againe, how shall wee know that a bishop is to bee placed in a Citie, that hee must bee a person thus and thus (according to *Pauls* Canons) qualified: all is voided, and made not to belong to a bishop. For those who are called bishops, were Presbyters and no bishops, bishops being then to be understood onely under the name of Apostles and Angels. Thirdly, antiquity doth testifie, that this was an honour to bishops, when this name was Ecclesiastically appropriated to them. But if they ever had been tearmed by the name of Apostles before, this had been a debasing of them. Neither is there reason why they should bee called Apostles. In jurisdiction Apostolicall the Apostles were not succeeded. Jurisdiction Episcopall they never exercised, nor had, and therefore could not bee succeeded in it. The Apostles gave to Presbyters that which Christ gave them out of his power; even the power of ordinary government. They are bid *ποιμαίνειν*, and *βόσκειν*, to feed as well by government as doctrine. They are bid not to play the Lords over the flock. What feare of tyranny where there is no power of government? But lay authorities aside, consider the thing from the text it selfe. First, *Paul* seemeth but occasionally to send him, hee having purposed to have sent *Timothy*, who as yet could not bee imployed. *I thought it necessary to send Epaphroditus to you.* Secondly, hee doth imply, that *Epaphroditus* had not returned to them, but that hee sent him; and that therefore hee was not the ordinary bishop of it. It is like, hee was but sent till *Timothy* might bee dispatched to them. Neither is it any thing probable he should bee called an Apostle, as their ordinary and eminent Pastor. In the Scriptures, none are said to be Apostles further then they are in habitude to some sending them. Now this is undoubted, the Philippians had sent him to *Paul*. It is then most probable when he is called

called their Apostle, it is in regard he was sent by them, which the Apostle pointeth at in the next words, *who hath ministred to me the things needfull which you sent by him.* Object. But it is unlikely that this word appropriated to the Twelve, should be used of those sent civilie. Not so, for while the persons sending are signified, they are sufficiently contradistinguished; it being the Priviledge of the Apostles, that they were the Apostles of Christ Jesus, not simply that they were Apostles. Secondly, *Iohn* 13. It is made common to all that are sent. For though Christ meane it of himselfe, yet he implies it by a discourse, *a genere ad speciem.* Thirdly, we see the like phrase, 2 Cor. 8. *The Apostles of the Churches.* For (*bryefly me*) there understandeth those whom the Churches had sent for that present. That doth not hinder, they were by *Paul* to the Churches, therefore the churches might not send them with their contributions. Neither is this an argument that he was their bishop, because their church sent him: for they sent Apostles themselves and Evangelists also more ordinarily, it being their office to goe from church to church, for the edification of them.

For the instance of *Archippus* I finde it not urged.

Now to come to the last instances of *Timotheus* and *Titus.*

First, we deny the Antecedent, that they were instituted bishops by *Paul.* And in the first prosillogisme we deny the Assumption: *that the Epistles doe presuppose so much.* And to the prosillogisme, tending to prove this assertion denyed, we answer: first, to the proposition, by distinguishing the Episcopall authority, which is considered both in regard of that which is materiall, and in regard of the formall reason which doth agree to it. The Proposition is true, understanding it of authority in both these regards; those who are presupposed to have had authority Episcopall given them, both for the substance of it, and the formall reason which doth agree to it in an ordinary bishop, they are presupposed bishops: but this is denyed. For they are presupposed to have and exercise power Episcopall for the materiall of it, as Apostles had also; but not to have and exercise in that manner and formallity which doth agree to a Bishop, but which doth agree to an Evangelist, and therefore they are bidden to doe the worke of an Evangelist, to exercise all that power they did exercise as Evangelists. There is nothing that *Paul* writeth to *Timothy* to doe in *Ephesus*, or to *Titus Crete*, which himselfe present in person might not and would not have done. If wee should reason then thus: Hee who did exercise Episcopall power in these churches, he is presupposed to have beene bishop in them. This proposition is not true, but with limitation: Hee who exercised Episcopall power after that formall manner, which doth agree to the office of a Bishop, hee was Bishop; but not hee who exerciseth the

power *secundum aliam rationem & modum*: viz. after such a manner as doth agree to an Apostle.

To the second maine proofe, wee deny the proposition. If patternes for Bishops, then written to Bishops. The reason is, Apostles, Evangelists, ordinary Pastors, have many things common in their administration. Hence is it, that the example of the one may be a patterne to another, though they are not identically and formally of one calling. Councells have enjoyned all Presbyters to be well seene in these Epistles, as being patternes for them, *Vide Aug. De doctrin. Christ. cap. 16. lib. 4.*

To the third reason. *Who so prescribing them their duties doth propose the very duties of Bishops, hee doth take them to have beene Bishops.* The Proposition is not true without a double limitation. If the Apostle should propose such duties of Bishops as they in later times usurped, he doth not therefore presuppose them bishops, because these are duties of Evangelists, agreeing to bishops onely by usurpation. Againe, should he propose those duties which, say they, the word doth ascribe and appropriate to bishops, yet if he doe not prescribe them as well in regard of matter as forme exercised by them, it will not follow that he doth take them for bishops: nor that *Paul* doth purpose the very duties of bishops, both in substance and manner of performance. Secondly, we deny him to purpose for substance the duties of bishops. For hee doth not bid him ordaine, as having a further sacramentall power then other Ministers, nor governe with power directive and corrective over others. This exceedeth the bounds of all ministeriall power. Thirdly, *Timothy* is not bid to lay on hands or doe any other act, when now churches were constituted, but with concurrence of those churches; *salvo uniuscuiusque Ecclesiæ iure*, the Apostles did not otherwise. For though *Paul* wrote to him alone, that was because he was occupied not onely in churches perfectly framed, but also in the erecting and framing of others. Secondly, because they were in degree and dignity above all other ordinar governours of the Church, which their Consul-like preheminencye was sufficient, why they should be written to alone.

To the fourth reason: *Those things which were written to informe; not onely Timothy and Titus, but all their successours, who were Diocesan Bishops, those were written to Diocesan Bishops. But these were so, Ergo.* The Proposition is not true, because it presupposeth that nothing written to any persons, can informe Diocesan bishops, unlesse the persons to whom it is written be formally in that selfe same order. For if one Apostle should write to another touching the duty Apostolique, it might informe any Doctor or Pastor whatsoever. Secondly, wee deny Diocesan bishops are (*de iure*) successours. As for the equivocall

equivocall Catalogue which maketh all who are read bishops to have beene Diocesan, we shall speake of them hereafter. The bishops betweene *Timothy* and *Stephanus* in the time of the *Chalcedon* Councell, were not all of one cut: and there are no churches read in *Crete* which were not Congregations. There is no more to prove *Phillip* of *Gortina* a Metropolitan, then to prove *Ignatius* Metropolitan of Syria; For what doth story relate, but that *Phillip* was amongst other a bishop of those Churches which were in Crete. There are many Churches in England, a Minister of which Churches is such an one, that is one Minister amongst others of those Churches. To that of their residing there and dying in these Churches. First, the proposition is not necessary. For as *James* might reside exercising an Apostolicall inspection in a particular Church, so might these exercise an Evangelicall function how long soever they resided. Secondly, the assumption will not bee found true for ordinary constant residence neither in Scripture nor fathers. For *Timothy*, though he be exhorted to stay at Ephesus, yet this doth not argue it, that he was enjoyned ordinary residence. For first it was a signe he was not bishop, because *Paul* did exhort him, for he would well have knowne, he might not, being their ordinary Pastor leave them, further then the more important good of the Church should occasion. 2. He is bid to stay there, not finally, but till the Apostle should come to him, which though he might be delayed, it is plaine he then intended. So *Titus* is placed in *Crete*, not to stay there, and set downe his rest, but ἐπιδιορθώσῃ, further to set, as it were, and exedifie the fabricke, which *Paul* had begun. God gave Ceremonies μεχρὶ καιροῦ διορθωσεως Διόρθωσις, is not ever a correcting of any thing amisse, but a setling every thing right, by erecting the substance foreshadowed. But say it were correcting, it were but such a correction as one might performe *in transitu*, with a little longer stay, though not ordinary residence. By Scripture the contrary is manifest.

For first, it is not like that *Timothy* was placed bishop after *Paul* s being at Rome; for when *Paul* saith he prayed him, when now hee was going to Macedonia, to stay at Ephesus, he doth intimate that when hee left him they were there both together. Secondly, when he wished him to abide there, hee had a meaning to come unto *Timothy* thither where he left him, so as at least to call on him, and see the Church. But *Paul* after his parting from the Presbyters knew he should never see the Ephesians more. Act. 20. If wee say he doth foretell it for likely, so we may say, that of wolves arising was, and call all into question. Neither is it likely, but that teares would have broke his heart, and made him yeeld in the peremptories of his speech, had not his soule beene divinely perswaded. Thirdly, he had no meaning when he left them to constitute

Timothy

Timothy to be their Bishop: for he would not have omitted such an argument of consolation to hearts so heavy. Nor he doth not mention any such purpose when he did write to them his Epistle. Hee telleth Churches usually when himselfe hath meaning to see them, or to send others. Fourthly, Timothy was with Paul while hee was in bonds at Rome, as witnesse those inscriptions of the Epistles to the *Colossians* and *Philippians*; yea *Timothy* was so with him, as to bee imployed by him, sent forth, and returne to him, which is manifest. Philip. 2. If he were after this placed in *Ephesus*, yet he was not placed to be resident, for in the end of the Epistle, he doth bid *Timothy* come to him, and bring *Marke*, that they might minister to him. Againe when hee did write the 2. Epistle, *Timothy* was not *Ephesus*, for he doth bid him salute *Aquila* and *Priscilla* and *Onesiphorus*. Object. But is like these were at *Ephesus*, for there *Paul* left *Aquila* and *Priscilla*. They came occasionally, they did not fixe there, which *Chrysostome* also judgeth. And the house of *Onesiphorus*, *Bernard* taketh it, was at Iconium in Lycaonia, so that it is like he was in his native countrey at this time, even Iconium, Listra, Derbe, which happily is the cause why the Scholasticall story doth make him Bishop of Lystra, because hither he was last sent. He was so here, as that the Apostle did but send him to see them, for hee biddeth him come before winter. Besides, there are many probalities he was not at *Ephesus*, for he speaketh of it through the Epistle, as a place now remote from him. *Thou knowest what Onesiphorus did for mee at Ephesus*, not *where now thou art. I have sent Tychius to Ephesus, not to thee*, to supply thy place while thou shalt bee absent. Finally, after *Paules* death hee did not returne to Ephesus, but by common consent went to *Iohn* the Apostle, and very little before his death came to Ephesus, if ever. As for the Fathers therefore in this point, if they testifie ordinary residence, which they doe not, wee have liberty to renounce them; but they testifie onely that he remained in that Church, because his stay was longer there then Evangelists did use to make, and he is thought to have suffered martyrdome there. So for *Titus*, when *Paul* sent him to Crete to doe that worke is uncertaine; but this is certaine, it was before his writing to the Corinths the second time, and going to Rome. This likewise: that *Paul* was then in travelling, and as it is like being in the parts of Macedonia did mean to winter at *Nicopolis*. When he did write the Epistle he doth shew it was not his meaning that *Titus* should stay there, for hee doth bid him to meete him at Nicopolis, where he meant to be as it is likely, but *Titus* comming did not meete him there, but at length found him in Macedonia, whence *Paul* did send him to the Corinthians, *thanking God for his promptnesse even of his owne accord to be imployed amongst them*, 2 *Cor.* 8. 16. which doth shew

shew he had not beene made an ordinary bishop any where. We find that he did accompany *Paul* at Rome, 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. and when *Paul* writ his second Epistle to *Timothy*, he was in Dalmatia. Whence *Aquinas* doth thinke him to have beene bishop of that place. Wherefore wee thinke him that will bee carried from such presumptions, (yea manifest arguments) by *Hegesippus*, *Clemens*, and history grounded on them, to be too much affected to so weake authors, and wish not credit with him, who counts him unworthy credit, that will not sweare what such men depose.

Touching the proofe that followeth, *That either function was Evangelisticall and extraordinary, or ordinary. But their function as assigned to those Churches was not extraordinary.* We deny this assumption, with the proofe of it. *That the function that these exercised as assigned to certaine Churches (these two by name) was necessary to the being of the Church.* The reason is, because they were assigned to doe those things which are to be done for ever in the church after a more transcendent manner; viz. as Evangelists; and assignation of them to doe those things in certaine Churches after this manner, was not necessary to perpetuate the being of the Church. Assignation to churches to doe the worke of ordinary Pastors is indeed necessary: not assignation to doe the worke of Evangelists.

To that finall reason, what antiquity doth testifie agreeing with Scriptures is true, and so to be taken. What they speake so agreeing, that it is virtually conteined in them, and may rightly be deduced from them, is to bee beleived and received by a divine faith. But what they speake not plainely contradicted, but yet no way included, may be admitted *fide humana*, if the first relators be well qualified witnesses. But what they speake from such as *Clement* and *Hegesippus*, it is is in effect of light credulity. A corrupt conscience bent to decline is glad of every colour which it may pretend to justifie it selfe in declining.

To the assumption we answer. What do not some ancient enough cal *Timothy*? *Ambrose* saith he was a Deacon one while, a Presbyter another while, & in like sense others a Primate & a Bishop. *Lyra* proveth him from many authorities to have been an Arch-bishop, and *Titus* a Priest. *Beda* calleth him an Apostle. But to gather on these, that he was in propriety of speech all these, were absurd. Object. I, but they call him bishop on other grounds, because assigned to this Church. Answ. They call him bishop because he was assigned to this Church, not onely to teach, but also to ordaine Deacons, Presbyters. For wheresoever they found this done, and by whomsoever, they did call them bishops, as I noted before from *Oecumen.* The fathers therfore may be well construed calling these bishops, because they made longer stay in these Churches then Evangelists did usually, & did preach

and ordaine, and doe in these Churches all such things which Bishopes in their time used to doe. But that he was not an Evangelist, and more then an ordinary bishop they do not deny. *Salmeron* himselfe in his first Disputation on 1 *Tim.pag.* 405. *Videtur ergo quod fuerit plus quam Episcopus, etiamsi ad tempus in ea civitate ut Pastor prædicaverit & sacros ordines promoverit, unde quidem vocant eum Episcopum.* Finally, should they in rigour and formall propriety make him an ordinary Pastor from the first time *Paul* did write to him ordinarily resident to his end; they should testifie a thing, as I hope I have shewed, contrary to Scripture, yea contrary to that text which maketh him to have done the worke of an Evangelist. As for the shew from the Subscriptions we have spoken sufficiently.

Now to shew that they were not properly bishops. First, we have shewed that they were but subrogated to doe those supposed Episcopall duties a while, but were not there fixed, to make their ordinary abode. Therefore not bishops properly. Secondly, they who did the worke of an Evangelist in all that they did, did not perform formally the worke of a bishop. But these did so. As is vouched of *Timothy*, *Doe the worke of an Evangelist.* Ergo. The Proposition is proved. If an Evangelist and bishop cannot be formally of one office, then the act of an Evangelist, and the act of an ordinary Pastor or bishop cannot be formally one. For when every thing doth *agere secundum quod actu est*, these things which are not the same formally, their worke and effect cannot be formally the same. But the Evangelist and the ordinary Pastor or bishops, are not formally the same. Ergo. The assumption the Apostle proveth, by that distinct enumeration of those whom Christ gave now ascending by the the worke of Ministery to gather and build his Church. For as an Apostle is distinguished from a Prophet, a Prophet from an Evangelist, so an Evangelist from an ordinary Teacher.

Object. But it may be said, they were not distinct, but that the superiour contained the inferiour, and Apostles might be Evangelists properly, as *Matthew* and *John* were.

Answ. That former point is to be understood with a graine of salt. The superiour contained the inferiour virtually and eminently, in as much as they could doe *altiori tamen ratione*, what the inferiour did. This sense is tollerable. But that formally the power of all other offices suites which the Apostles is false. My Lord chiefe Justice of England is not formally a Constable. As for the latter, true, an Apostle might be also a penmen of the Gospell, but this maketh not an Evangelist more then an Apostle, but doth *per accidens*, come to them both. And even as a Preacher or Pastor, writing Commentaries, and publishing other Treatises, this commeth *per accidens* to his calling, it doth not make him a Pastor, but more illustrious

lustrious and fruitfull in that regard then another. So *Marke* and *Luke* was not therefore Evangelists because they did write the Gospels, for then none should have beene Evangelists that had not written, but in this regard they were more renowned then other. Custome hath so prevailed, saith *Maldonate* in his Preface on *Matthew*, that wee call them Evangelists, (*viz.* the Writers of the Gospells) whom the Scriptures never call Evangelists. These Evangelists *Paul* speaketh of were given at Christs ascension, but the first writer of the Gospell, being an Apostle, was at least eight yeares after. Secondly, they were a distinct order of workemen from the Apostles, but two of the penmen of the Gospels were Apostles. Thirdly, they were such as by labour of ministery (common for the generall of it to all other) did gather Saints, and build Christs Body. Now writing the Gospell was not a labour of Ministery common to Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, but the publishing of it.

Those degrees which Christ did distinctly give to othersome, and othersome, those he did not give conjoynedly to one and the same persons. But these callings he gave to some one, to others another. Else he must have said, he gave the same men to be Apostles and Evangelists, the same to be Evangelists and Pastors. Ergo.

That calling which is not compatible with the calling of an Evangelist, that *Paul* never annexed to an Evangelist. But the calling of a bishop is such. For a bishop is tyed to a particular Church. The calling of an Evangelist is a calling whereby one is called to the worke of the Ministery, to gather Saints, and edifie Christs body, without any limitation to any particular Church. Ergo, *Paul* never annexed the calling of a bishop to an Evangelist.

The calling of an Evangelist is not to write the Gospell, nor to preach it simply: for then every Minister of the Word should be an Evangelist. But this doth difference them, to preach it without limitation or assignation to any particular church. Thus *Philip* thus all those who were the Apostles helpers, working the work of the Lord as they did were Evang of which sort some continued to the time of *Commodus* the Emperour, as *Eusebius* reporteth, *Euseb. hist. li 5. cap. 9.* Now a calling whereby I am thus called to publish the Gospel, without fixing my selfe in any certaine place; and a calling which bindeth during life to settle my selfe in one Church, are incompatible.

Lastly, that which would have debased *Timothy* and *Titus*, that *Paul* did not put upon them. But to have brought them from the honour of serving the Gospell, as *Collaterall* companions of the Apostles to be ordinary Pastors, had abased them. Ergo, this to be ordinary Pastors *Paul* did not put upon them. *Object.* The assumption is denyed, it was no abasement. For before they were but Presbyters, and afterward by imposition of hands were made bishops.

why should they receive imposition of hands, and a new ordination, if they did not receive an ordinary calling? we meane if they were not admitted into ordinary functions by imposition of hands. I answer, This deny all with all whereon it is builded is grosse: For to bring them from a Superiour order to an Inferiour, is to abase them. But the Evangelists office was superiour to Pastors. Ergo. The assumption proved. First, Every office is so much the greater, by how much the power of it is of ampler extent and lesse restrained. But the Evangelists power of teaching and governing was illimited. Ergo. The assumption proved. Where ever an Apostle did that part of Gods worke which belonged to an Apostle; there an Evangelist might doe that which belonged to him. But that part of Gods worke which belonged to an Apostle he might doe any where without limitation. Ergo. Secondly, every Minister by, how much he doth more approximate to the highest, by so much he is higher. But the companions, & coadjutors of the Apostles, were nearer then ordinary Pastors. Ergo. Who are next the King, in his Kingdome, but those who are *Regis Comites*. The Evangelists were *Comites* of these Ecclesiasticall Cheiftaines. *Chrysostome* doth expresly say on Ephes. 4. That the Evangelists in an ambulatory course spreading the Gospell, were above any bishop or Pastor which resteth in a certaine Church. Wherefore to make them Presbyters is a weake conceite. For every Prsbyter (properly so called) was constituted in a certaine Church to doe the worke of the Lord in a certaine Church. But Evangelists were not, but to doe the worke of the Lord in any Church as they should be occasioned. Ergo, they were no Presbyters properly so called. Now for their ordination; *Timothy* received none as the Doctor conceiveth, but what hee had from the hand of the Apostle and Presbyters, when now he was taken of *Paul* to be his companion. For no doubt but the Church which gave him a good testimony, did by her Presbyters concurre with *Paul* in his promoting to that office. Obj. What, could they lay on hands with the Apostles, which *Phillip* could not, and could they enter one into an extraordinary office? Answ. They did lay on hands with the Apostles, as it is expresly read, both of the Apostles and them. It is one thing to use precatory imposition, another to use miraculous imposition, such as the Apostles did, whereby the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were conferred. In the first, Presbyters have power. Neither is it certaine, that *Phillip* could not have imposed hands, and given the Holy Ghost. For though he could, he might choose in wisedome for their greater confirmation and edification to let that be done by persons more eminent. Finally, imposition of hands may be used in promoting and setting one forth to an extraordinary office.

For

For every extraordinary office is not attended with immediate vocation from God. As the calling of Evangelists, though extraordinary, was in this unlike the calling of Apostles and Prophets. Secondly, men called immediately may be promoted to the more fruitfull exercise of their immediate and extraordinary callings by imposition of hands from their inferiours, as *Paul* and *Barnabas* were. Howsoever, it is plaine, that *Timothy* by imposition of hands, was ordained to no calling, but the calling of an Evangelist. For that calling he was ordained to, which he is called on by *Paul* to exercise, and fully execute. But he is called on by him to doe the work of an Evangelist. Ergo, that calling he was ordained to.

That worke which exceedeth the calling of an ordinary bishop, was not put upon an ordinary bishop. But *Titus* his worke did so: for it was to plant Presbyters Towne by Towne through a Nation. Ergo. For the ordinary plantation and erecting of Churches to their due frame, exceedeth the calling of an ordinary bishop. But this was *Titus* his worke. Ergo. Bishops are given to particular Churches when now they are framed, that they may keepe them winde and wether tight, they are not to lay foundations, or to exedifie some imperfect beginnings. But say *Titus* had beene a bishop: he is no warrant for ordinary bishops, but for Primates whose authority did reach through whole Ilands. Nay, if the Doctors rule out of *Theodoret* were good, it would serve for a bishop of the plurality cut. For it is said he placed Presbyters city by city, or Towne by Towne, who are in name onely bishops, but not that he placed Angels or Apostles in any part of it. He therefore was the sole bishop of them, the rest were but Presbyters, such as had the name, not the office and government of Bishops.

Finally, were it granted that they were ordinary bishops, and written to doe the things that bishops doe, yet would it not be a ground for their majority of power in matter sacramentall and jurisdiction, as is above excepted.

The fifth Argument.

The Ministers which the Church had generally and perpetually the first 300. yeares after Christ and his Apostles, and was not ordained by any generall Councell, were undoubtedly of Apostolicall institution. But the Church ever had Diocesan bishops in singularity of preheminence during life, and in majority of power of ordination and jurisdiction above others, and these not instituted by generall Councells. Ergo, The proposition is plaine both by *Austin de Bapt. contra Donat. lib. 4. & Epist 118.* and by *Tertul. Constat. id ab Apostolis traditum quod apud Ecclesias Apostolorum fait sacrosanctum.* For who can thinke that all the Churches generally, would conspire to abolish the order of Christ planted by the Apostles, and

set up other Ministers then Christ had ordained. The assumption is plaine : for if the Church had Metropolitans anciently, and from the beginning, as the Councell of Nice testifieth, much more bishops. For Diocesan bishops must bee before them, they rising of combination of Cities and Dioces. And the councell of Ephesus testifieth, the government of those bishops of Cyprus, to have been ever from the beginning, according to the custome of old received. Yea, that the attempt of the bishop of Antioch, was against the Canons of the Apostles. Againe, *Cyprian* doth testifie, that long before his time, b shops were placed in all Provinces and Cities, besides the succession of bishops from the Apostles times: for they prove their originall to have beene in the Apostles times. Neither were they instituted by any generall councell. For long before the first generall councell, we read Metropolitans to have beene ordained in the Churches. Yea, *Jerom* himselfe is of opinion, that no councell of after times, but the Apostles themselves did ordaine bishops ; for even since those contentions wherein some said, *I am Pauls, others, I am Apollos*, they were set up by generall decree : which could not bee made, but by the Apostles themselves. And in *Psal.* 44. hee maketh *David* to prophecy of bishops, who should be set up as the Apostles Successors.

Answer.

First, we deny the proposition. For first, this doth presuppose such an assistance of Gods Spirit with the Church, that she cannot generally take up any custome, or opinion, but what hath Apostolicall warrant, whereas the contrary may be shewed in many instances. Keeping of holy dayes was a generall practise through the Churches, before any councell enacted it, yet was no Apostolicall tradition. *Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 22. Evangelium non imposuit hoc, ut dies festi observentur, sed homines ipsi suis quique locis ex more quodam introduxerunt.* Taking the Eucharist fasting, the fasts on Wednesday, and Saturday, fasting in some fashion before Easter, ceremonies in baptising, the government of Metropolitans were generally received before any councell established.

2. It doth presuppose, that the Church cannot generally conspire in taking up any custome, if she be not led into it by some generall proponent, as a generall representative councell, or the Apostles, who were Oecumenicall Doctors, but I see no reason for such a presumption.

3. This doth presuppose, that something may be which is of Apostlicall authority, which neither directly nor consequently is included in the word written. For when there are some customes which have beene generall, which yet cannot be grounded in the word written, it is necessary by this proposition, that some things

may

may be in the Church having authority Apostolicall, as being delivered by word unwritten. For they cannot have warrant from the Apostles but by word written or unwritten. To the proofe we answer: That of *Tertullian* maketh not to the purpose, for hee speaketh of that which was in Churches Apostolicall, as they were now planted by them, which the sentence at large set downe will make cleare. *Si constat id bonum quod prius, & id prius quod est ab initio, ab initio quod ab Apostolis, pariter utiq; constabit id esse ab Apostolis traditum quod apud Ecclesias Apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum.* Touching *Austins* rule we would aske what is the meaning of these words, *Non nisi Apostolica authoritate traditum rectissimè creditur.* If they say his meaning is, that such a thing cannot but in their writings be delivered, they doe pervert his meaning, as is apparent by that, *Conf. Don. lib. 2. 27. Consuetudinem ex Apostolorum traditione venientem, sicut multa non inveniuntur in literis eorum, & tamen quia custodiuntur per universam Ecclesiam, non nisi ab ipsis tradita & commendata creduntur.* And we wish them to shew from Scripture what they say is contained in it. If they yeeld, he doth meane as he doth of unwritten tradition, we hope they will not justifie him in this; we will take that liberty in him, which himselfe doth in all others, and giveth us good leave to use in his owne writings. Now count him inch to favour Traditions, as some of the Papists do not causelessly make this rule the measuring cord, which doth take in the latitude of all traditions: yet wee appeale to *Austines* judgement otherwhere, who though by this rule hee maketh a universall practise not begunne by Councells, an argument of Divine and Apostolicall authority, yet dealing against Donatists, Lib. 1. Don. cap. 7. hee saith, he will not use this argument, because it was but humane and uncertaine, *ne videar humanis argumentis illud probare, ex Evangelio profero certa documenta.*

Wee answer to the assumption two things: First, it cannot bee proved, that universally there were such Diocesan bishops as ours. For in the Apostles times it cannot be proved, that Churches which they planted were divided into a mother Church, and some Parochiall Churches. Now while they governed together in common with Presbyters, and that but one congregation, they could not be like our Diocesan bishops. And though there bee doubtfull relations, that Rome was divided under *Evaristus*, yet this was not common through the Church. For *Tripartite* story testifieth, that till the time of *Sozomen*, they did in some parts continue together. Trip. hist. lib. 1. cap. 19. Secondly, those Bishops which had no more but one Deacon to helpe them in their ministery toward their Churches, they could not be Diocesan Bishops. But such in many parts the Apostles planted, as *Epiphanius* doth testifie. Ergo.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, such Countries as did use to have bishops in villages and little townes, could not have Diocesan bishops. But such there were after the Apostles times in Cyprus and Arabia, as *Sozom.* in his 7. booke, cap. 10. testifieth. Ergo. Diocesan bishops were never so universally received. Secondly, bishops came to be common by a Councell, saith *Ambrose*, *Prospiciente Concilio.* *Amb. in 4. ad Eph.* or by a Decree passing through the world: *toto orbe decretum est*, saith *Jerom ad Evag.* which is to bee considered not of one Oecumeniall Councell, but distributively, in that singular Churches did in their Presbyteries decree, and that so, that one for the most part followed another in it. This *interpretativè*, though not *formaliter*, is a generall decree. But to thinke this was a decree of *Pauls*, is too too absurd. For besides that the Scripture would not have omitted a decree of such importance, as tended to the alteration of and consummation of the frame of Churches begun through all the world. How could *Ierom* (if this decree were the Apostles) conclude that bishops were above Presbyters *magis consuetudine Ecclesiæ*, then *Dominicæ dispositionis veritate.* If the Doct. do except, that custome is here put for *Apostolicall institution*; let him put in one for the other, and see how well it will become the sense. *Let Bishops know they are greater then priests rather by the Decree of the Apostle, then by the truth of Christs disposition.* Is it not fine, that the Apostles should be brought in as opposites, facing Christ their Lord? And this conclusion of *Ierom* doth make me thinke that *decretum est* imported no more, then that it was tooke up in time for custome through the world. Which is elegantly said to be a decree, because custome groweth in time to obtaine *vim legis*, the force of a decree. But *Ambrose* his place is plain, *Prospiciente Concilio*, he meaneth not a councell held by Apostles. For he maketh this provision by councell to have come in when now in Egypt & Alexandria, Presbyters according to the custome of that Church, were not found fit to succeed each other, but they chose out of their presbyteries men of best desert. Now to *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, there were a succession of Presbyters in the Church of Alexandria, as *Eusebius* and *Ierom* both affirme. Wherefore briefly, seeing no such universall custome can be proved, all the godly fathers never conspired to abolish Christs institution. Secondly, could a custome have prevailed with all of them, whom we have to *Constantines* time, yet it might enter and steale upon them through humane frailty, as those errours in doctrine did upon many otherwise godly and faithfull Martyrs: the rather because the alteration was so little at the first and Aristocraticall government was still continued. Thirdly, say, they had wittingly and wittingly done it through the world, they had not conspired, because they might have deemed such power in the Church, and themselves to doe nothing but what they might with

with Christs good liking for the edification of it. How many of the chiefe Patrons of this cause, are at this day of this judgement, that if it were but an Apostolicall institution, as Apostolicall is contradistinguished to divine, they might change it. But if the Apostles did enact this order, as Legats and Embassadours of Christ, then is it not theirs, but Christs owne institution. What an Embassadour speaketh as an Embassadour, it is principally from him that sent him: but if they who were Legates, did not, bearing the person of Legats, but of ordinary Ecclesiasticall governours, decree this; then it is certaine, Church governours may alter it without treasonable conspiring against Christ.

As for those proofes, that Bishops have beene throughout all Churches from the beginning they are weake. For first, the Councell of Nice useth ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, not *simpliciter*, but *secundum quid*, in order happly to that time wherein the custome began, which was better knowne to them then to us: the phrase is so used, Act. 15.8. in respect of some things which had not continued many yeares. They cannot meane the Apostles times, for then Metropolitans should have actually beene from the Apostles time. Secondly, the phrase of the Councell of Ephesus, is likewise æquivocall; for they have reference to the fathers of Nice, or at least the decrees of the fathers, who went before the Councell of Nice. For those words being added, *definitiones Nicenæ fidei*, seeme to explaine the former, *Canones Apostolorum*. It is plaine the decree of the Councell doth ascribe this thing onely to ancient custome, no lesse then that of Nice, Constantinople and Chalcedon; and therefore cannot rise to the authority of sacred Scriptures. Let him shew in all antiquity where sacred Scriptures are called Canons of the Apostles. Finally, if this phrase note rules given by the Apostles, then the Apostles themselves did set out the bounds of Cyprus and Antioch. As for the authority of *Cyprian*, he doth testifie what was *Communiter* in his time, Bishops odained in cities; not *universaliter*, as if there were no city but had some. Secondly, hee speaketh of Bishops who had their Churches included in Cities, not more then might meet together in one, to any common deliberations. They had no Diocesan Churches, nor were bishops who had majority of rule over their Presbyters, nor sole power of ordination. As for the Catalogue of succession, it is *pompæ aptior quam pugnæ*; Rome can recite their successors. But because it hath had bishops. Ergo, Oecumenicall bishops is no consequence. All who are named bishops in the Catalogue, were not of one cut, and in that sense we controvert.

Touching that which doth improve their being constituted by any Councell, it is very weake. For though wee read of no generall

Councell, yet there might be, and the report not come to us. Second'y, we have shewed, that the Councell of Nice doth not prove this that bishops were every where from the beginning; the phrase of from the beginning, being there respectively, not absolutely used. Neither doth *Jerom* ever contrary this: for hee doth not use those words in propriety, but by way of allusion; otherwise if hee did think the Apostle had published this decree, when the first to the Corinths was written, how can he cite testimonies long after written, to prove that Bishops were not instituted in the Apostles time, but that they were ordained by the Church *jure Ecclesiastico*, when the time served for it.

The sixt Argument.

Such as even at this day are in the reformed Churches, such Ministers are of Christs institution. But Ministers having singularitie of preheminence and power above others, are amongst them, as the Superintendents in Germany. Ergo. *Answ.* The assumption is utterly denied. For Superintendents in Germany are nothing like our Bishops: they are of the same degree with other Ministers, they are onely Presidents while the Synod lasteth; when it is dissolved, their prerogative ceaseth: they have no prerogative over their fellow Ministers; they are subject to the Presbyteries, Zepp. lib. 2 cap. 10. pag. 324. The Synod ended, they returne to the care of their particular Churches.

The seventh Argument.

If it were necessary that while the Apostles lived, there should bee such Ministers as had preheminence and majority of power above others, much more after their departure. But they thought it necessary, and therefore appointed *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Apostolicke men furnished with such power. Ergo, much more after their departure. *Answ.* The assumption is denyed, and formerly disproved: for they appointed no such Apostolicke men with Episcopall power, in which they should be succeeded.

The eighth Argument.

Such Ministers as were in the Apostles times not contradicted by them, were lawfull. For they would not have held their peace, had they knowne unlawfull Ministers to have crept into the Churches.

But there were before *Johns* death in many Churches a succession of Diocesan Bishops, as in Rome, *Linus*, *Clemens*, at Jerusalem *James Simeon*, at Antioch, *Evodius*, at Alexandria, S. *Mark*, *Anianus*, *Abilius*. Ergo, Diocesan Bishops be lawfull.

Answer. The assumption is denyed: for these Bishops were but

Pres.

Presbyters, Pastors of one congregation ordinarily meeting, governing with common consent of their Presbyteries. If they were affecting our bishops majority, they were in *Diotrophes* sufficiently contradicted.

The ninth Argument.

Those who have beene ever held of a higher order then Presbyters, they are before Presbyters in preheminence, and majority of rule. But bishops have beene held in a higher order by all antiquity. Ergo. The assumption is manifest: In the Councell of Nice, Ancyra, Sardica, Antioch, Ministers are distinguished into three orders. *Ignatius*, *Clemens* in his Epistle to *James*, *Dionys. Areopag. de Coel. Hierom. cap. 5. Tertull. de fuga in persecutione, & de Baptismo. Ignatius* doth often testifie it. No wonder, when the Scripture it selfe doth call one of these a step to another, 1 Timoth. 3. 13. Cyprian. Lib. 4. Ep. 2. Counc. Ephes. Cap. 1. 2. 6. Yea the Councell of Chalcedon counteth it sacriledge, to reduce a Bishop to the degree of a Presbyter. This *Hierome* himselfe confirmeth, saying: That from *Marke* to *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, the Presbyters did set a bishop over them in higher degree.

Answer.

The Proposition is not true in regard of majority of rule. For no Apostle had such power over the meanest Deacon in any of the Churches. But to the Assumption we answer by distinction.

An order is reputed higher, either because intrinsecally it hath a higher vertue, or because it hath a higher degree of dignity and honour. Now wee deny that ever antiquity did take the bishop above his Presbyters to be in a higher order then a Presbyter, further then a higher order doth signifie an order of higher dignity and honor, τάξις or βάθμος μείζονος τιμῆς, as the Councell of Sardica speaketh. Which is further proved: because the fathers did not hold a bishop to differ from a Presbyter, as Presbyter from a Deacon. For these differ *genere proximo*; *Noverint Diaconi se ad ministerium non ad sacerdotum vocari*. But a bishop differeth from a Presbyter, as from one who hath the power of Priesthood no lesse then himselfe, and therefore the difference betwixt these, must be circumstantially, not so essentiall as betwixt the other. Thus bishops and Archbishops are divers orders of bishops, not that one exceedeth the other, as a power of higher vertue, but of higher dignity then then the other. More plainely; There may be a fourefold difference *in gradu. 1. in potestate graduum. 2. in Exercito. 3. in Dignitate. 4. in amplitudine Iurisdictionis.* The first difference is not betweene a bishop and a Presbyter, ac-

cording to the common tenent of antiquity, or the Schoole, but only is maintained by such as hold the Character of a Priest and Bishop inwardly, diverse one from the other. For as a bishop differeth not in power and degree from an Archbishop, because nothing an Archbishop can doe, as confirming, consecrating Bishops, &c. but a bishop can doe also. So neither doth a Presbyter from a bishop. *Object.* But the Priest cannot ordaine a Presbyter, and confirme as the bishop doth, and therefore differeth *Potestate gradus.* To this I answer, that these authours meane not this difference in power (*de fundamentali & rem ta potestate, sed ampliata, immediata, & jam actu horum efficiuum productiva*) as if Presbyters had not a remote and fundamentall power to doe those things: but that they have not, before they be ordained bishops, their power so enlarged, as to produce these effects actually. As a boy hath a generative faculty while he is a child, which he hath when he is a man, but yet it is not in a child free from all impediment, that it can actually beget the like. But this is too much to grant. For the power sacramentall in the Priest, is an actuall power which hee is able to performe and execute, nothing defective in regard of them, further then they be with-held from the exercise of it. For that cause which standeth in compleat actuality to greater & more noble effects, hath an inferior & lesser of the same kind under it also, unlesse the application of the matter be intercepted. Thus a Presbyter he hath a sacramentall power standing in full actuality to higher sacramentall actions, & therfore cannot but have these inferior of confirmation and orders in his power, further then they are excepted & kept from being applied to him. And therefore power sacramentall cannot be in a Presbyter, as the generative faculty is in a child, for this is inchoate onely, and imperfect, such as cannot produce that effect. The power of the Priest is compleat. Secondly, I say, these are no sacramentall actions. Thirdly, were they, yet as much may be said to prove an Archbishop a distinct order from a bishop, as to prove a Presbyter and bishop differing in order. For it is proper to him out of power to generate a bishop, other bishops laying on hands, no otherwise then Presbyters are said to doe, where they joine with their bishops. If that rule stand not *major ad minori*, nor yet *equalis ab equali*, I marvel how bishops can beget bishops equall, yea superior to them, as in consecrating the Lord Archbishop, & yet a Presbyter may not ordaine a Presbyter. It doth not stand with their Episcopall majority, that the rule (*every one may give that which he hath*) should hold here in the exercise of their power. Those who are in one order may differ *jure divino* or *humano*. *Aaron* differed from the Priests not in power sacramentall, for they might all offer incense, and make intercession. But the solemne intercession in the holy of holies

God

God did except and appropriate to the high Priest the type of Christ. Priests would have reached to this power of intercession in the holy place, or any act of like kinde: but that God did not permit that this should come under them, or they intermeddle in it. Thus by humane law the bishop is greater in exercise then the Priest. For though God hath not excepted any thing from the one free to the other, yet commonly confirmation, ordination, absolution by imposing hands in receiving Penitents, consecrating Churches and Virgines, have beene referred to the bishop for the honor of Priesthood, rather then any necessity of law, as *Jerom* speaketh. Finally, in dignity, those may differ many waies, who in degree are equall, which is granted by our adversaries in this cause. Yea, they say in amplitude of jurisdiction, as in which it is apparant an Archbishop exceedeth another. But were it manifest that God did give bishops Pastorali power through their Diocesse, and an Archbishop through his Province, though but when hee visiteth, this would make one differ in order from the other; as in this regard Evangelists deffered from ordinary Pastors. But that jurisdiction is in one more then another, is not established, nor hath apparency in any Scripture.

To the proofes thereof I answer briefly: the one may be a step to the other, while they differ in degrees of dignities, though essentially they are but one and the same order. In this regard it may be sacriledge to reduce one, from the greater to the lesser, if he have not deserved it. As for that of *Jerom* it is most plaine, hee did meane no further order, but onely in respect of some dignities wherewith they invested their bishop, or first Prebyter, as that they did mount him up in a higher seat, the rest sitting lower about him, and gave him this preheminence to sit first as a Consull in the Senate, and moderate the carriage of things amongst them: this *Celsiori gradu*, being nothing but his honourable ἀξίωσις, not importing sole authority. For by a Canon of Councell of Laodicea, wee finde that the bishop had this priviledge to sit first, though Presbyters did together with him enter, and sit as Judges of equall commission. For though Deacons stood, Presbyters did alwaies sit *in circuitu Episcopi*.

10. *Argument.*

If bishops be that which *Aaron*, and the Apostles were, and Presbyters, be that which the Priests, and the 72. Disciples were, then the one are above the other in preheminence and power. But they are so. See *Jerom* to *Nepotian*. Ergo.

Answer.

If bishops, &c. and Presbyters, be that which the sonnes of *Aaron* and the 72. were, then there are different orders, &c. To these

may be added a third. That which *Moses* and the 70. Seniors were, that are the bishops and Presbyters. First, for the proposition it is not true, for first of *Aaron* and his sonnes, they were not orders different essenally in their power, but onely in degree of dignity, wherein the high Priest was above others. For every Priests power would have reached to that act which was reserved to the high Priest onely. Besides, when the high Priest was deceased or removed, the other Priests did consecrate the successour, as *Sadock*. Finally, the one had for substance the same consecration that the other, neither had the high Priest any majority of directive or corrective power over others. So the Apostles, and 72. will not be found different in order; and therefore those who resemble these cannot be concluded to be of divers orders. For the Apostles and 72. differ no more then ordinary messengers who are impolyed in a set course, and extraordinary sent by occasion onely: They were both messengers, the Apostles *habitu* and abidingly, the other in act onely, and after a transitory manner.

Againe, had *Aaron* and his sonnes beene divers orders, differing essentially in the inward power of them, yet is not the proposition true, but with addition in this wise. Those who are indentically and formally that which *Aaron* and the Apostles were, and that which his sonnes, and the 72. were, they differ in degree essentially, not those who were this analogically by reason of some imperfect resemblance. For things may be said to be those things wherewith they have but imperfect similitude. In this sense onely the proposition is true.

Now to come to the assumption. First, touching *Aaron*, wee deny any bishop is as *Aaron* by divine institution, or by perfect similitude answering to him. But because *Aaron* was the first and high Priest, others inferiour: so it hath pleased the Church to imitate this pollicy, and make the bishop, as it were *Primum Presbyterum* or *Antistitem in primo ordine*, Presbyters *in secundo*. Whence Bishops may be said to be that which *Aaron* was through the Churches ordination, which she framed, looking to this patterne of government which God himselfe had set out in the old Testament. The fathers call them *Aaron* and his sonnes onely for some common analogy, which through the ordinance of the Church arose betwixt the bishops and Presbyters, and them; and conceive them to be so by humane accommodation, not by divine institution. But that they were so properly succeeding them as orders of Ministery typified by them by Gods owne appointment, this the fathers never thought. Christs priesthood, no mans, was properly typified in *Aaron*.

So touching the other part of the assumption, That Bishops and Presbyters are what Apostles, and the 72 were. The fathers many of them insist in this proportion, that as the Apostles and 72 were teachers, the one in a higher, the other in an inferiour order, so bishops and Presbyters, were by the Churches ordinance. This is the fathers phrase, to call them Apostles, who in any manner resemble the Apostles to call them, as *Ambrose.* Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Doctors, who resemble these, and come in some common analogie neerest them, *Moses* and the 70 Seniors, who in any sort resembled them. Now the assumption granted in this sense maketh not against us. For they might be said these, if there were but diverse degrees of dignity amongst them, though for power of order by Gods institution they were all one. But some straine it further, and take it, that Christ instituting those two orders, did in so doing, institute Bishops and Presbyters, the one whereof succeeded the Apostles, the other the 72. and that thus the Fathers take it. To which I answer, First, in generall, this analogy of Apostles and 72: is not generally affected by them all. *Ignatius ad Smyrnenses dicit Apostolis Presbyteros successisse, Diaconos 72. discipulis. Clem. lib. 2. Const. cap.* 30. saith, That Bishops answer to God the Father, Presbyters to Christ, Deacons to the Apostles. *Ierom* doth manifestly make Presbyters (whom hee also calleth by name of Bishops in that Epistle, where hee maintaineth the Presbyters dignity) successours to the Apostles. The like hath *Cyprian, Apostolus id est Episcopos & praepositos*, that is, *ordinis ratione praepositos minorum Ecclesiarum*, as *Austin* speaketh, else it should bee all one with the former; when hee maketh the Presbyter as well as the Bishop to bee ordained in the Apostles. Finally, these Fathers who take the 72. to have beene Apostles, as well as the other; could not imagine this porportion of diverse orders set up in them. Secondly, if Christ in these instituted those other, it must bee one of these waies. First, hee did make these not onely Apostles, but Bishops, and so the 72. not onely his messengers for the time, but Presbyters also. Or, secondly, else hee did ordaine these as he did raine Manna, noting and prefiguring as by a type, a further thing which hee would worke: viz. that he would institute Bishops and Presbyters for Teachers ordinary in his Church: but both these are *gratis* spoken without any foundation or reason. For the first, wee have shewed that the Apostles could not bee Bishops ordinarily; nor yet the calling of these seventy two (which was to goe through all Cities Evangelizing) stand with Presbyters, Presbyters being given to Churches κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, and there fixed. Neither can the latter be true: for then

then Christ should have given a Sacrament, when he ordained his Apostles, and sent forth his 72. Secondly, the type or the shadow is lesse then the thing typified, the substance of it. But the giving Apostles was a greater thing then giving ordinary Pastors. Ergo. Thirdly, I say, that Christ did never ordaine that any should succeed the Apostles, or the 72. in regard of their order. There is a double succession, *in gradum*, or *in Caput*, as the jurists distinguish. *In gradum eundem*, as when one brother dying, another brother doth succeed him in the inheritance. *In Caput*, as when one not of the same degree and line doth come after another, as when a brother dying another doth inherit after him, not a brother, but a cosin to him. Thus the Apostles have no successors succeeding them *in gradum*, but such onely as follow them, being of other degrees, and in another line, as it were, in which sort every Pastor doth succeed them. But then they are said to succeed them, because they follow them, and after a sort resemble them, not because they hold the places which the Apostles did properly. *Apostolo in quantum est Apostolus non succeditur, Legato quatenus est Legatus non succeditur.* Fourthly, that the Presbyters doe as persons of a diverse order succeed the Apostles no lesse fully then any other. First, they must needs succeed them who are spoken to in them, whose duties are laid downe in that which the Apostles received in commandement. But the Presbyters were spoken to both in the Keyes, in the Supper, in the commandement of teaching and baptizing. Ergo, Presbyters must needs succeed the Apostles. Secondly, those whom the Apostles did institute in the Churches, which they had planted for their further building them up, they were their next successors. But the Apostles did commend the Churches to the care of Presbyters who might build them up, whom they had now converted. Ergo, these were their successors most proper and immediate. Thirdly, these to whom now taking their farewells they resigned the Churches, these were their successours. But this they did to Presbyters, *Paul* now never to see Ephesus more, *Act.* 20. *Peter* neere death, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. Ergo. Fourthly; if one Pastor or Minister doe more properly resemble an Apostle then another, it is because hee hath some power Apostolique more fully conveyed to him then to another. But this was not done. Ergo. The assumption is manifest: for first, their power of teaching and ministring the Sacraments doth as fully and properly belong to the Presbyter as to any, unlesse we count Preaching not necessarily connexed to a Presbyters office, but a bishops; or at least that a more rudimentall preaching belongs to a Presbyter, the more full and exact teaching being appropriate to the Bishop, which are both too absurd. Secondly, for governement, the Apostles did no more give the power of governement to one

one then to another. *Object.* This is denyed, for the Apostles are said to have kept the power of ordination, and the coercive power in their owne hands, and to have committed these in the end onely to Apostolike men, as *Timothy*, *Titus*, who were their successours, succeeding them in it. *Answ.* A notable fiction: for it is most plaine by Scripture; that ordination, power of deciding controversies, excommunication, were given to Presbyters, and not kept up from them; they should otherwise have provided ill for the Churches which they left to their care. Secondly, if the Apostles did commit some ordinary power of government to some men above others, in which regard they should be their successours, then the Apostles did not onely enjoy as *Legates* power over the Churches, but as ordinary Ministers. For what power they enjoyed as *Legates*, this they could not *alijs Legare*. Power as ordinary Pastors in any Nations or Churches they never reserved, and therefore did never substitute others to themselves in that which they never exercised nor enjoyed. And it is to be noted, that this opinion of Episcopall succession from the Apostles is grounded on this, that the Apostles were not onely Apostles, but Bishops in Provinces and particular Churches. For the Papists themselves urged with this, that the Apostles have none succeeding them, they doe consider a double respect in the Apostles, the one of *Legates*, so *Peter*, nor any other could have a successour. The other of bishops, *Oecumenicall* in *Peter*, of Bishops Nationall or Diocesan, as in some other. Thus onely considered, they grant them to have other Bishops succeeding them: For the Apostolick power precisely considered, was *Privilegium personale simul cum persona extinctum.* Now we have proved that this ground is false, and therefore that succeeding the Apostles, more appropriate to Bishops then other Ministers grounded upon it, is false also.

Lastly, the Presbyters cannot be said successors of the seventy two. For first, in all that is spoken to the seventy two, the full duty and office of a Presbyter is not laid downe. Secondly, it doth not appeare that they had any ordinary power of preaching or baptizing and ministering the other Sacrament. For they are sent to Evangelize, to preach the Gospell: but whether from power of ordinary office, or from commission and delegation onely for this present occasion it is doubtfull. Thirdly, it is not read that they ever baptized, or had the power of administring the Supper given to them: Yea, that they had neither ministery of Word or Sacraments *ex officio ordinario*, seemeth hence plaine; That the Apostles did choose them to the Deacons care, which was so cumbersome that themselves could not tend the ministery of the Word with it, much lesse then could these not having such extraordinary gifts as the Apostles had. Fourthly, if they were set Ministers, then were they Evangelists in destination. For the act

enjoyned them, is from City to City, without limitation to Evangelize; and after we read of some, as *Philip*, that he was an Evangelist; the same is in ecclesiasticall story testified of some others. Thus we Presbyters should succeed Evangelists those Apostolique men, whom the Apostles constituted Bishops, and by consequence be the true successours of the Apostles. These Evangelists succeeded them by all grant, we succeed these. Finally, *Armachanus* doth take these 72. to have been ordinary disciples, in his 7. *Book Armenicarum quæst. cap* 7.

11 *Argument.*

Those who receive a new ordination are in a higher degree in a new administration, and a new order. But Bishops doe so. Ergo.

Answer.

The proposition is denyed: for it is sufficient to a new ordination that they are called to exercise the Pastorall function in a new Church, where before they had nothing to doe. Secondly, I answer by distinction, a new order, by reason of new degrees of dignity, this may be granted: but that therefore it is a new order, that is, having further ministeriall power in regard of the Sacraments and jurisdiction given it of God, is not true. Hath not an Archbishop a distinct ordination or consecration from a Bishop? yet is he not of any order essentially differing. The truth is, ordination, if it be looked into, is but a canonicall solemnity which doth not collate that power Episcopall to the now chosen, but onely more solemnly and orderly promotes him to the exercise of it.

12 *Argument.*

Those Ministers whereof there may be but one onely during life in a Church, they are in singularity of preheminence above others. But there may be but one Bishop, though there may be many other Presbyters, one *Timothy*, one *Titus*, one *Archippus*, one *Epaphroditus*. Ergo. For proofe of the assumption. See *Cornelius*, as *Eusebius* relateth his sentence, *lib.6. cap.* 43. *Conc. Nice. cap* 8. *Conc. Calced. cap.* 4. *Possidonius in vita Augustine. Ierom. Phil.* 1. *ver.* 1. *Chrysost. Amb. Theod. Oecumen.* And such was Bishops preheminence, that Presbyters, Deacons, and other Clerkes, are said to be the Bishops Clerks.

Answer.

I answer to the Assumption. That there may be said to be but one Bishop in order to other Coadjutors and Associates within the same Church. It may be said, there must be but one Bishop in order to all the other Churches of the Cities. Secondly, this may be affirmed as standing by Canon, or as divine institution. Now the assumption is true, onely by Law Ecclesiasticall. For the Scripture is said to have placed Presbyters who did *Superintendere*, *Acts* 20. and

that

that there were Bishops at *Philippi*. True it is, the Scripture doth not distinguish how many of the one sort, nor how many of the other, because no doubt for the number of the Congregations, a single Presbyter labouring in the Word, or two, the one coadjutor to the other might be placed. Secondly, it is testified by *Epiphanius*, that ordinarily all Cities but *Alexandria* had two. Thirdly, *Ierom* on 1 Tim. 3. doth say, that now indeed there may be but one Bishop, meaning Canonically, making a difference twixt the present time and time Apostolique. Fourthly, *Austin* did not know it was unlawfull: Yea, he did onely in regard of the decree of Nice, account it so. *Ep.* 110. neither did Church or people ever except against the contrary, but as a point against Canon, which might in some cases be dispensed with, as the story of *Narcissus*, and *Alexander*, and *Liberius*, and *Felix* did more then manifest. For though the people of Rome cried out, one God, one Christ, one Bishop, yet they yeelded at their Emperours suite, whereas had it beene a thing they had all thought to have been against Christs institution, they would not have done. *Vide Soz. lib. 4. cap. 14.* Fiftly, *Icroms* peereleſſe power, is nothing but Consul-like presidence above others; for this he pleaded for, writing against *Iovinian*, *lib. 1.* amongst the Apostles themselves, that schisme might be avoided. Wherefore we yeeld the conclusion in this sense, that the Bishop *jure humano*, hath a singularity of preheminence before others, as by Ecclesiasticall law there might be but one onely Archbishop.

13 *Argument.*

Those who had peereleſſe power above others in ordination and jurisdiction, they were such as had preheminence and majority of rule over others. But the former is due to Bishops. Unleſſe this singularity of power were yeelded, there would be as many schismes as Priests. Ergo. The assumption proved. *Those who have a peculiar power of ordination above others, they are in preheminence and power before others. But Bishops have, Ergo,* they are in, &c. The assumption proved. That which was not in the Presbyters of *Ephesus* and *Crete* before *Timothy* and *Titus* were sent, but in the Apostles, and after in *Timothy* and *Titus* and their succeſſours, that is a peculiar of Bishops. But ordination was not in the Presbyters, &c. Ergo. The assumption proved. That which these were sent to doe, Presbyters had not power to doe. It was therefore in them, and such as succeeded them, the Bishops of Ephesus and Crete. Againe, the Scriptures, Councels, Fathers, speake of the ordeynor as one. Ergo, it was the peculiar right of the Bishop, and the Bishop onely. He onely by Canon was punishable for irregularity in ordination. And *Epiphanius* maketh this the proper power of a Bishop to beget fathers by ordination, as the

Presbyters doth sonnes by baptisme. And *Jerom* doth except ordination as the bishops peculiar, wherein he is most unequall to them.

Answer.

I answer the proposition of the first syllogisme by distinction. Those who have peereleſſe power in regard of the simple right to ordeine: viz. in regard of exercising the act, and sole performing the rite of it, those who have a right to these things originally from Christ and his Apostles, which no others have, they are above others in degree. Againe, peereleſſe power in a bishop over Presbyters may be said in comparison to them distributively or collectively considered. He that hath peereleſſe power given him, which no one of the other hath, is not presently of a greater degree, nor hath not majority of rule amongst others, as a Consul in the Senate: but if he have a peereleſſe power, such as they all collectively considered, cannot controule, then the Proposition is true; but the Assumption will then be found to halt.

To the proofe of the assumption. The Proposition is true of power in order to the thing it selfe, not to ministring the rite, and executing the act, which may be reserved for honour sake to one, by those who otherwise have equall power with him. That bishops have this power in order, the thing it selfe agreeing to them, *Vt proprii officii*, not by commission from others, we deny. The assumption is wholly denyed. As for the proofe of it. First, we that deny that Evangelists had not power to ordeine, as well as Apostles. Secondly, that Presbyters had not this power in a Church planted as well as they. Every one as fellow servants might conspire in the same ordination. The Evangelists power did not derogate from the Apostles, the Presbyters from neither of them. But power of imposing hands solitarily, whereas yt Churches were not constituted, this may happily be appropriated to the Apostles and Evangelists, whose office it was to labour in erecting the frame of Churches. Secondly, the assumption is false; in denying that it was in the power of Presbyters to lay on hands, contrary to that in *Timothy*; *The grace given thee by laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.* Thirdly, it is false, in presupposing others then Presbyters to have beene *Timothy* and *Titus* their successours. To the proofe of this assumption. The proposition is not true: For it might be convenient that the same thing should be done by Evangelists, and by ordinary Pastors, each concurring in their severall orders to the same service of Christ the Lord. Secondly, I answer to the assumption. That Presbyters were to be placed in Churches framed where there were Presbyters, or where there were as yet none. In the

first

first Churches, they are bid ordaine, if any need further, but *salvo jure Ecclesiæ*, not without the concurrence of others. In the latter Churches which were to be constituted, they may be conceived as Evangelists, with sole power of setting Presbyters forth by this rite of imposition of hands. We hold Apostles might doe it, Evangelists might, and the Presbyteries also. Yea, Presbyters in Alexandria when now their first Presbyter was deceased, did ordaine the following: For the Canon of three bishops, and Metropolitans, added by the Nicene Councell, was not knowne yet. Nevertheless it grew timely to be restrained to bishops, the performing I meane of the outward rite and signe; but onely by Canon, as Confignation was also, for which there is as ancient testimonies as this, that it was appropriate to the Bish. We grant therefore that antiquity doth sometime speake of the ordainer as one. In the Churches of Affrica one did not lay on hands, yet in some other Churches the rite was by one administred. And it is to be noted by the way, that εἰς ἐπίσκοπον in some Canons is not opposed to the Coordaining of Presbyters, but to the number of *Three*, or many bishops required in the ordination of a bishop. They might therefore by their Canons be punishable, because regularly and canonically the executing of it was committed to them. This is all that *Epiphanius* or *Ierom excepta ordinatione* can prove. But these two conclusions we would see proved out of Scriptures and Fathers. First, that ordination is an action of power, of order, a power sacramentall, which a Presbyter hath not. Secondly, that by vertue of this power, the bishop doth ordaine, and not by Ecclesiasticall right or commission from the Church. Certainly, the act of promoting a minister of the Church, is rather an act of jurisdiction then order. As it belongeth to policy and government, to call new Magistrates, where they are wanting. *Object.* But a new spirituall officer may be instituted by a sacrament. *Answ.* If God would so have collated the grace of spirituall callings; but he hath appointed no such thing. The Apostles and 72. were not instituted by a sacrament or imposition of Christs hands. Now the greater the grace was which was given, the more need of a sacrament whereby it should be given. *Object.* They were extraordinary. *Answ.* They might have had some ambulatory sacrament for the time. Againe, imposition of hands was used in giving extraordinary graces, Acts 8. Secondly, were it a sacrament, it should conferre the grace of office, as well as grace sanctifying the person to use it holily. But we see that this it could not do As for *Paul* and *Barnabas* the Church did separate them at the command of God, and lay hands on them, and pray for them, but they were already before this, immediately chosen by God to the grace of their office. It could be nothing then but a gesture accompanied with prayer, seeking

grace.

grace in their behalfe. For the sacramentall collating of grace sanctifying all callings, we have in these two sacraments of Christs institution. Thirdly, there are many kindes of imposition of hands in the old and new Testament, yet cannot it be proved, that it is any where a proper sacrament. It is then a rite, a gesture, a ceremony, signifying a thing or person separate, presented to God, prayed for to God. Thus Antiquity did thinke of it, as a gesture of one, by prayer to God, seeking a blessing on every one chosen to this or that place of ministery. So Ecclesiastically it was used in baptising, in consecrating, in reconciling penitents, as well as ordaining: but never granted as a sacrament in those other cases by grant of all. It is then a rite or gesture of one, praying. *Tertul. de bapt.* sheweth this saying, *Manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans & invitans spiritum sanctum. Ierom* also *contra Luciferanos, Non abnuo, hanc esse Ecclesiæ consuetudinem ut Episcopus manum impositurus excurrat ad invocationem spiritus sancti. Ambr. de dignit. sacerdot. Sacerdes imponit supplicem dextram. August. Quid aliud est manus impositio quam oratio? &c.* The Greeke Churches have ever given Orders by a forme of prayer conceived with imposition of hands. Hence it is, that they imposed hands even on Deaconesses, where it could not be otherwise considered then a deprecative gesture. Neither is it like the African Fathers ever thought it a sacrament, which no other had vertue and power to minister, but the Bishop. For then they would never have admitted Presbyters to use the same rite with them. For so they had suffered them to prophane a sacrament, wherein they had no power to intermeddle. *Object.* If one say they did lay on hands with them, but the Bishops imposition was properly *Consecrative* and sacramentall, theirs *Dedicative* onely. *Answer.* Besides that this is spoken without foundation, how absurd is it, that the very selfesame sacramentall rite should be a sacrament in one ministers hand, and no sacrament performed by another: Yea, when the Bishop doth it to a Presbyter, or Deacon, then a sacrament; when to a Subdeacon, and other inferiour officers, then none, let any judge. *Austin* did account no other of imposition of hands, then a prayer over a man, accompanied with that gesture. Secondly, they doe not thinke that the Bishop ordaineth by divine right, it being excepted to him as a minister of higher sacramentall power: but that he onely doth ordaine *quoad signum & ritum extrinsecum*, by the Churches commission, though the right of ordaining be in all the Presbytery also. As in a Colledge the society have right to choose a fellow, and to ordaine him also, though the master doth alone lay on hands, and give admission. Thus *Ierom* speaketh of confirmation, that it was reserved to the Bishop for honour sake, rather

rather then any neceſſity of Gods law. Whence by analogie and proportion, it followeth they thinke not ordination, or thoſe other Epiſcopall royalties to have beene reſerved to him by divine right. Beſide, there are more ancient proofes for Canonicall appropriating confirmation, then for this impoſition of hands. *Cornelius* ſpeaketh thus of *Novatus*, he wanted thoſe things which he ſhould have had after Baptiſme, according to the Canon, the ſealing of our Lord from a Biſhop, *Euſeb. Lib 6. cap.25.* So *Cyprian* to *Iul.* Nevertheleſſe, *Ierom* judgeth this alſo to have beene yeelded them for honour ſake. And we know that in the Biſhops abſence, Presbyters through the Eaſt did *Confignare*, through Grecia, through Armenia. Neither would *Gregory* the great have allowed Presbyters in the Greeke Churches to have confirmed, had he judged it otherwiſe then Canonically to belong to the biſhops. That therefore which is not properly a ſacramentall action, and that which is not appropriate to a biſhop further then Presbyters have committed it to him, that cannot make him in higher degree of miniſtery then Presbyters are.

Thirdly, in reconciling penitents; the Presbyters did it in caſe of the biſhops abſence: as is to be gathered from the third Councell of Carthage, 32. And who thinkes bleſſing ſo appropriate to a biſhop, that Presbyters may not ſolemnly bleſſe in the name of the Lord, though antiquity reſerved this to him. Theſe therefore were kept to him, not as acts exceeding the Presbyters power of order, but for the ſuppoſed honour of him and the Church. For as *Ambroſe* ſaith, *Ut omnes eadem poſſunt irrationale, & vulgaria res viliſq; videretur.* It pleaſeth antiquity therefore to ſet up one who ſhould *quoad exercitium* doe many things alone, not becauſe that Presbyters could not, but it ſeemed in their eyes more to the honor of the Church, that ſome one ſhould be intereſted in them.

Fourthly, *Amalarius* in a certaine booke of ſacred orders, doth confute the doctrine of an uncertain author, who taught that one biſhop onely was to lay hands on a Deacon: becauſe he was conſecrated not to Prieſthood, but to miniſtery and ſervice. *Nunquid ſcriptor libelli doctior & ſanctior Apoſtolis qui poſuerunt plures manus ſuper Diaconos quando conſecrabantur, & propterea ſolus Epiſcopus manus ponat ſuper Diaconum, ac ſi ſolus poſſit precari virtutem gratiarum quem plures Apoſtoli precabantur. Optimum eſt bonos duces ſequi, qui certaverunt uſq; ad plenam victoriam.* Whence it is plaine, he did know no further thing in impoſition then prayer, which the more impoſed, is the more forcible.

The fourteenth Argument.

Thoſe who had juriſdiction over Presbyters aſſiſting them, and Presbyters affixed to Cures, they had a ſuperiority of power over other miniſters. But biſhops had ſo, Ergo, &c.

The

The Assumption is manifest. *Ignatius* describeth the Bishop from this, that he should be the governour of the Presbytery and whole Church ὁμοῦ ἄρχειν. And *Ierom* and *Austin* on the 44. Psalme, call them the Princes of the Church, by whom she is governed. The assumption is proved particularly. Those who had directive power above others, and corrective, they had majority of rule. But B shops had. Ergo. The assumption proved. First, for directive power, the Presbyters were to doe nothing without them. *Ignat. ad Mag. ad Smyr.* They might not minister the sacrament of the supper but under the B shop, *Clem. Epist. 1. ad Jacob. Tert. lib. de bapt. Can. Apost.* 38, *Con. Carthag.* 4. 38. *Con. Car.* 2. *Can.* 9. *Con. Gan.* 16. *Conc. Ant. Can.* 5.

Secondly, that they had corrective power, it is proved, *Apoc.* 2 & 3. The Angel of *Ephesus* did not suffer false Apostles, and is commended for it, the Angel of *Thiatira* is reproved for suffering the like. Therefore they had power over other ministers. Cypr. lib. 3. Epist. 9. telleth *Regutian* he had power to have censured his Deacon. *Ierom. adversus Vigilantium*, marvelleth that the Bishop where *Vigilantius* was, did not breake the unprofitable vessell. *Epiphanius* saith Bishops governed the Presbyters themselves, they the people. The Presbyters affixed to places and Churches, were subject to the, Bishops, for when they were vacant, the bishop did supply them. Againe, the Presbyters had their power from him, and therefore were under him, and they were subject to the censure of the bishop. Those of his Clergie were under him; for he might promote them, they might not goe from one Dioceſſe to another without him, nor travell to the citie, but by his leave. The bishop was their judge, and might excommunicate them, Cypr. li. 1. Epist 3. Concil. Carth. 4. cap. 59. Conc. Chal. cap. 9. conc. Nice. cap. 4. conc. Ant. cap. 4. ibid. cap. 6. cap. 12. Cart. 2. cap. 7. conc Afric. cap. 29. conc. Ephes. cap. 5. conc. Chal. cap. 23. The examples of *Alexander* and *Chrysostome* prove this. All Presbyters were counted *acephali*, headlesse, that lived not in subjection to a bishop. The Pastors of parishes were either subject to bishops, or they had associates in Parishes joyned with them, or they ruled alone. But they had not associates, neither did they rule alone. Ergo, they were subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the bishop.

Answer.

The proposition of the first Syllogisme it must be thus framed. Those who had power of jurisdiction in themselves, without the concurrence of other Presbyters, as fellow judges, they were greater in majority of rule. Thus bishops had not jurisdiction. True it is, they were called governours and Princes of their Churches, because they were more eminent ministers, though they had

not

not Monarchiall power in Churches, but Consull-like authority: and therefore when they affected this Monarchy, what said *Ierom*, *Noverint se sacerdotes esse non dominos, noverint se non ad Principatum vocatos, ad servitium totius Ecclesiæ.* Sic Origen in Esa. hom. 7.

To the proofe of the Assumption. Wee deny that they had this directive power over all Presbyters. Secondly, that they had it over any ty humane constitution infallible. Presbyters were in great difference. Those who are called *propriy sacerdotes*, *Rectores*, *Seniores*, *Minorum Ecclesiarum præpositi*, the Bishop had not, nor challenged not that directive power over them, which hee did over those who were numbred amongst his Clerickes, who were helpes to him in the Liturgy, in Chapells and parishes which did depend on him as their proper teacher, though they could not so ordinarily goe out to him. The first had power within their Churches, to teach, administer, excommunicate, were counted brethren to the bishops, and called *Episcopi*, or *Coepiscopi*, even of the Ancient: But the Presbyters which were part of their Clergy, they had this directive power over them, the Canons Ecclesiasticall allowing the same. But I take these latter to have beene but a corruption of governing Presbyters, who came to bee made a humane ministery. 1. by having singular acts permitted. 2. by being consecrate to this, and so doing *ex officio*, what they were imployed in by the bishop. But sure these are but helpes to liturgy, according to the Canons. Preaching did not agree to them further then it could bee delegated or permitted. Finally, wee read, that by law it was permitted them: that it was taken away from them againe by the bishops: that it was stinted and limited sometimes as to the opening of the Lords Praier, the Creed and ten Commandements: as it is plaine to him that is any thing conversant in the ancient. Secondly, let us account them as Ministers of the word given by God to his Church: then I say, they could not have any direction, but such as the Apostles had amongst Evangelists: and this power is given to the bishops onely by canon swerving from the first ordinance of Christ: for it maketh a Minister of the word become as a cypher, without power of his consecration, as *Ierom* speaketh, being so interpreted by *Filson* himselfe. These decrees were as justifiable as that which forbiddeth any to baptise, who hath not gotten chrisme from the bishop *Con. Carth. 4. cap. 36.* unlesse the phrases doe note onely a precedence of order in the bishop above Presbyters, requiring presence and assent, as of a fellow and chiefe member, not otherwise.

To the proof of the second part of the former assumption, 1. we deny this majority of corrective power to have beene in the Apostles themselves: they had only a ministry executive inflicting that which

Christs corrective power imposed. Secondly, we deny that this ministeriall power of censuring was singularly exercised by any Apostle or Evangelist, where Churches were constituted. Neither is the writing to one above others, an argument that he had the power to doe all alone without concurrence of others. To that of *Cyprian* against *Rogatian*; we deny that *Cyprian* meaneth he would have done it alone, or that he and his Presbytery could have done it without the consent of Bishops neighbouring: but that he might in regular manner have beene bold to have done it, because he might be sure, *quod nos collegæ tui omnes id ratum haberemus.* *Cyprian* was of judgement, that he himselfe might doe nothing without the consent of his Presbyters, unlesse he should violate his duty, by running a course which stood not with the honour of his brethren. It was not modesty in him; but due observancy, such as he did owe unto his brethren. Neither did *Cyprian* ever ordinarily any thing alone. He received some, the people and the brethren contradicting, *lib.* 1. *epist.* 3. but not till he had perswaded them, and brought them to be willing. *Thou seest* (saith he) *what paines I have to perswade the brethren to patience.* So againe, *I hardly perswade the people, yea even wring it from them, that such should be received.* Neither did he take upon him to ordaine Presbyters alone: but propounded, made request for them, confessing, that further then God did extraordinarily prevent both him and them, they had the right of suffrage, no lesse then himselfe, as by these epistles may appeare, *lib.* 1. *epist.* 20. *lib.* 2. *epist.* 5. *lib.* 4. *epist.* 10. *Ierom* (though grandilequent sometimes) did never thinke a Bishop could lawfully without his Presbyteries concurrence, excommunicate. If he were as *Moses*, yet he would have these as the seventy. Againe, *Ierom* doth write expresly of all in generall, *Et nos senatum habemus, coetum Presbyterorum, sine quorum consilio nihil agi à quoquam licet, sicut Romani habuerunt senatum cujus consilio cuncta gerebantur.* *Epiphanius* saith, Bishops governed Presbyters: but it doth not follow, that therefore they did it alone without concurrence of their com Presbyters. As for the fixed Presbyters, the proofes are more unsufficient. The Bishop supplyed them, therefore they were under him. For Colleges supply Churches, yet have they no jurisdiction over them. Secondly, the canons did provide *ne plebi invite Presbyter obtruderetur.* Thirdly, we distinguish majority of rule from some jurisdiction. We grant the Bishop had such a jurisdiction as concerning the Church, so farre as it was in society with others, such as an Arch-bishop hath over a Province: but this did stand with the Rectors power of jurisdiction within his owne Church. Fourthly, though they had power by his ministeriall interposition, yet this doth not prove them dependant on him. For bishops have their power from others ordaining them, to whom notwithstanding they are not subject

ject in their Churches. In case of delinquency they were subject to the bishop with the Presbytery, yet so that they could not be proceeded against till consent of many other bishops did ratifie the sentence. Thus in *Cyprians* judgement; bishops themselves delinquent, turning wolves, as *Samosatenus, Liberius*, &c. are subject to their churches and Presbyteries, to be deposed and relinquished by them. As for those that were part of his clerks, it is true, they were in greater measure subject to him, absolutely in a manner for their direction: but for his corrective power he could not without consent of his Presbyters and fellow bishops, do any thing. The bishop indeed is onely named many times: but it is a common Synecdoche, familiar to the Fathers, who put the primary member of the church for the representative church, as *Austine* saith, *Petrum propter Apostolatus simplicitatem figuram Ecclesiæ gessisse*. See concil. Sardicen. cap. 17. conc. Carth 4. cap. 2. 3. Tol. 4 cap. 4. Socr. lib. 1. 3. Soz. lib. 1. cap 14. As for such examples as *Alexanders*, it is strange that any will bring it, when he did it not without a Synod of many bishops, yea without his Clergie, as sitting in judgement with him. *Chrysostomes* fact is not to be justified: for it was altogether irregular, savouring of the impetuous nature to which he was inclined, though in regard of his end, and unworthinesse of his Presbyters, it may be excused, yet it is not to be imitated. As for those headlesse Clerkes, it maketh nothing for the Bishops majority of rule over all Churches and Presbyters in them. For first, it seemeth to be spoken of those that lived under the conduct of the Bishop, a collegiat life together, *Eodem refectorio & dormitorii utebantur, & Canonicè viventes ab Episcopo instituebantur*. Now when all such Clerkes did live then as members of a Colledge under a master, it is no wonder if they be called headlesse, who did belong to no Bishop. Secondly, say it were alike of all Presbyters, which will never be proved (for all Presbyters in the Diocesse were not belonging to the Bishops Clerkes) say it were, yet will it not follow, that those who were under some, were subject to his authority of rule. For there is a head in regard of prefidency of order, as well as of power. Bishops were to finde out by Canon the chiefe bishop of their Province, and to associate themselves with him. So bishops doe now live ranged under their Archbishops as heads. Priests therefore as well as Clerkes, did live under some jurisdiction of the bishops; but such as did permit them coercive power in their owne Churches, such as made the bishop a head in regard of dignity, and not of any power, whereby he might sway all at his pleasure. Thirdly, if the bishops degenerate to challenge Monarchy or tyranny, it is better to be without such heads then to have them: as we are more happy in being withdrawen from the headship of the bishop of Rome, then if he still were head over us.

To the laſt inſinuation proving that biſhops had the governement of thoſe Churches which Presbyters had, becauſe neither Presbyters alone had it, nor with aſſiſtents. I anſwer, they had as well the power of government, as of teaching: and though they had not ſuch aſſiſtants as are the presbyters of a cathedral church, yet they might have ſome, as a deacon, or other perſon ſufficient in ſuch ſmall Churches. When the Apoſtles planted a biſhop and Deacon onely, how did this biſhop excommunicate? When the fathers of Africa did give a biſhop unto thoſe now multiplied, who had enjoyed but a Presbyter, what aſſiſtants did they give him? what aſſiſtants had the *Chorepiſcopi*, who yet had government of their Churches?

The fifteenth Argument.

That which the orthodoxe churches ever condemned as hereſie, the contrary of that is truth. But in *Aerius* they have condemned the deniall of ſuperiority in one Miniſter above others. Ergo, the contrary is truth.

Anſwer.

To the propoſition, we deny that it muſt needs be preſent'ly true, the contray whereof is generally condemned for hereſie. As the repreſentative catholicke Church may propound an error, ſo ſhe may condemne a particular truth, and yet remaine a catholicke church. To the aſſumption wee deny that the Church condemned in *Aerius* every denyall of ſuperiority, but that onely which *Aerius* runne into. Now his opinion I take to have been this. 1. He did with *Ierom* deny ſuperiority of any kinde as due by Chriſts ordinance: for this opinion was never counted hereſie, it was *Ierems* plainely. 2. Hee did not deny the fact, that biſhops were ſuperiour in their actuall admiſtration; he could not be ſo mad. If he had all that a biſhop had actually, how could he have affected to be a biſhop, as a further honour? Deniall of ſuperiority, ſuch as conſiſteth in a further power of order then a Presbyter hath, and in a kingly monarchicall majority of rule, this denyall is not here condemned: for all the fathers may be brought as witneſſes againſt this ſuperiorty of the Church. What then was condemned in him? A deniall of all ſuperiority in one miniſter before another, though it were but of honor and dignity: and ſecondly, the denying of this in ſchiſmaticall manner, ſo as to forſake communion with the Church wherein it is. For in theſe words, *μηδὲν εἶναι διαφορώτερον ἐπίσκοπον τῶ πρεσβυτέρω*, it ſeemeth *μηδὲν* ſhould bee read *μὴ δὲν*, that there ought to be none. Howſoever hee is to bee conceived as appoſing practically the difference of honour & dignity which was in the Church by Eccleſiaſticall inſtitution. What is this to us? Deniall of ſuperiority in regard of honor & dignity, joyned with ſchiſme, was condemned: Ergo, deniall of ſuperiority in power of order and kingly majority of rule, keeping the bond of love was condemned.

The

The assumption therefore if it assume not of this last deniall, then can it not conclude against us. Ergo, it is a truth that some Ministers may be above otherſome, in order, honor, and dignity. But they understand not by order such an order onely as is distinct, because some degree of dignity is appropriate to it, which is not to other. Though this argument therefore touch us not, yet to speake a little further about it, this opinion of *Aerius* is not to be handled too severely: neither our authors, D. *Whitakerus*, D. *Reynolds*, *Danæus*, to be blamed, who doe in some sort excuse him. For bishops were growne such that many good persons were offended at them, as the *Audiani*. Yea, it was so ordinary, that *Jerom* distinguisheth schisme from heresie, because the one conteined assertions against the faith, the other served from the Church by reason of dissenting from Bishops. See him on Tit. 3. 10. Neither is it plain that he was an Arrian. *Epiphanius* reporteth it, but no other, though writing of this subject and story of these times. Sure it is, *Eustathius* was a strong Arian, whom *Aerius* did oppose. Neither is it strange to bishops to fasten on those which dissent from them in this point of their freehold, anything whereof there is but ungrounded suspicion. Are not we traduced as Donatists, Anabaptists, Puritanes? As for this opinion, th y thought it rather schismaticall, then hereticall; & therfore happily called it heresie, because it included errour in their understanding, which with schismaticall pertinacy was made heresie. Neither is it like that *Epiphanius* doth otherwise count it heresie, nor *Austin* following him. For though *Austine* was aged, yet he was so humble, that hee saith, *Augustinus senex à puero nondum annículo paratus sum edoceri*. Neither was it prejudice to his worth for to follow men more ancient then himselfe, who in likelihood should know this matter also better. As for his calling it heresie, it is certaine he would not have this in rigour streined. For he doth protest (in his preface unto that booke of heresie) that none to his thought, can in a regular definition comprehend what that is which maketh this or that to be heresie. Though therefore he doubted not of this, that *Aerius* was in errour, such as Catholickes should decline: yet it doth not argue that hee thought this errour in rigour and former propriety, to have beene heresie. Thus much for this last Argument.

On the contrary side I propound these Arguments following to be seriously considered.

Argument. 1.

Those whom the Apostles placed as chiefe, in their first constituting of Churches, and left as their successours in their last farewels which they gave to the Churches, they had none superiour to them in the Churches. But they first placed Presbyters, feeding

with the Word and governing: and to those in their last departings they commended the Churches. Ergo. The assumption is denied: they did not place them, as the chiefe ordinary Pastors in those churches, but placed them to teach and governe, *in foro interno*; with a reference of subordination to a more eminent Pastor, which when now they were growen to a just multitude should be given to them. The Apostles had all power of order and jurisdiction: they give to Presbyters power of order, power to teach, minister sacraments, and so gather together a great number of those who were yet to be converted; but kept the coercive power in their owne hands, meaning, when now by the Presbyters labour, the churches were growne to a greater multitude, meaning (I say) then to set over them some more eminent Pastors, Apostolicall men, to whom they would commit the power of government, that so they might rule over both the Presbyters and their Churches; and to these with their successours, not to the Presbyters, were the churches recommended. All which is an audacious fiction, without any warrant of Scripture, or shew of good reason. For it is confessed that Presbyters were placed at the first constitution, as the Pastors and teachers of the Churches. Now if the Apostles had done this with reference to a further and more eminent Pastor and Governour, they would have intimated somewhere this their intention: but this they doe not; yea, the contrary purpose is by them declared. For *Peter* so biddeth his Presbyters feed their flocks, as that he doth insinuate them subject to no other but Christ, the Arch shepheard of them all. Againe, the Apostles could not make the Presbyters Pastors without power of government. There may be governours without pastorall power; but not a Pastor without power of governing. For the power of the *Pedum*, or shepheards staffe, doth intrinsecally follow the Pastorall office. What likelihood is there, that those who were set as parents to beget children, should not be trusted with power of the rod wherewith children now begotten are to be nurtured and kept in awe beseeming them? If it be said, every one fit for the office of a Teacher, was not fit for a Governour: I answer, he that is fit to be a Pastor teaching and governing *in foro interno*, is much more fit to be a Governour externally: he who is fit for the greater, is fit for the lesser. It was a greater and more Apostolicall worke to labour conversion, and bring the churches a handfull in the planting (as some thinke) to become numbersome in people, then it is to governe them being converted. And it is absurd to thinke that those who were fit to gather a church, and bring it to fulnesse from small beginnings, should not be fit to governe it, but stand in need to have some one sent, who might rule them and the churches they had collected. Secondly, these Presbyters were (as themselves

(selves confesse) qualified with the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost, and chosen by speciall designation: so that to impute insufficiency unto them, is harsh, and injurious to God, as well as to man. Finally, by the twenty of the Acts, and the first Epistle of *Peter*, cha. 5. it is plaine, they doe in their last farewels, commit the Churches unto the Presbyters, not suggesting any thing of a further Pastor to be sent, who would supply their roomes; which yet they would not have forgotten, being a thing of so great consolation, had it been intended by them.

Argument 2.

Those who have the name and office of Bishops common to them, they have no superiour Pastors over them: but the Presbyters Pastorall have that name and office attributed to them. For first they are said to governe in generall. Secondly, there is nothing found belonging to the power of the keyes *in foro externo*, but the Scripture doth ascribe it to them, power of suffrage in councell. *Acts* 15. power of excommunication, which is manifest to have beene in the churches of Corinth when it had no bishop; power of ordination, 1 *Tim.* 4. If any say, that this their power was but by commission in them, and that they were subordinate to the Apostles in exercise of it, being to reteine it onely untill such time as more eminent Pastors should be given: I answer, all this is spoken *gratis*, without any foundation, and therefore no more easily vouched then rejected: The Presbyters so had this power, that they did commit it to the bishops, as we shall shew after: and therefore it must have beene in them, not by extraordinary commission, but by ordinary office. Secondly, they were subject in exercise to none but Christ and the holy Ghost, who onely had out of authority trusted them with it. If the Apostles and they did concurre in doing one and the same thing, they did it as inferiour to the Apostles, and servants of a lower order, not with any subjection to them, as heads of derivation, serving Christ their onely Lord, no lesse immediately then the Apostles themselves.

Argument 3.

That which is found in all other orders of Ministers instituted by Christ, may be presumed likewise in the order of Pastors and Doctors: but in all other orders, there were none that had singularity of preheminence and majority of power above other: No Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist had this rule one over another. If the proposition be denied, upon supposall of a different reason, because that though parity in a few extraordinary Ministers might be admitted without disorder, yet in a multitude of ordinary Ministers, it could not but breed schisme and confusion, and therefore as the order of Priesthood was divided into

a high

a high Priest, and other secondary ones, so is it fit that the Presbyters of the new Testament should be devided, some being in the first, and some in the second ranke. To this I answer, the parity is the more dangerous, by how much the places are supereminent. Secondly, though Pastors should be equall, yet this would not bring parity into the Ministers of the Church, some whereof should bee in degree inferiour to other, the governing Elders to the Pastors, and the Deacons to them. Thirdly, if every Church being an Ecclesiasticall body, should have governours every way equall, there were no feare of confusion, seeing Aristocracy, especially where God ordaineth it, is a forme of gouernment sufficient to preserve order. But every Church might then doe what ever it would within it selfe. Not so neither; for it is subject to the censure of other Churches synodically assembled, and to the civill Magistrate, who in case of delinquency, hath directive and corrective power over it. Parity doth not so much indanger the Church by schisme, as imparity doth by tyranny subject it. As for the distinction of Priests, wee grant it; but as man could not have made that distiction, had not God ordained it in time of the old Testament, no more can we under the new. Howbeit, that distinction of Priests did bring in no such difference in order and majority of rule, as our Bishops now challenge.

Argument 4.

If some be inferiour unto othersome in degree of power, it must be in regard of their power to teach, or their power to govern, or in the application of this power to their persons, or in regard of the people whom they teach and governe, or finally in regard the exercise of their power is at the direction of another. But no Pastor or Teacher dependeth on an other but Christ for any of these. Ergo. The proposition standeth on a sufficient enumeration: the assumption may be proved in the severall parts of it. The former branch is thus cleared. First, the power we have, is the same essentially with theirs; yea, every way the same. Secondly, wee have it as imediately from Christ as they. I shew them both thus: The power of order is the power which inableth us to preach and deliver the whole counsell of God, and to minister all Sacraments sealing Gods covenant. Now unlesse we will with the Papists, say that preaching is no necessary *annexum* to the Presbyters office, or that his power is a rudimentall limited power, as to open the creed, Lords prayer, and commandements onely, or that he hath not the full power sacramentall, there being other sacraments of ordination and confirmation which wee may not minister, all which are grosse, wee must yeeld their power of order to be the same. Yea, were these sacraments properly, they are both grounded in the power

power a Presbyter hath: Ordination in *doe this in remembrance of me*: confirmation in power to baptize. The power being the same, it is happily in one immediately, and in the other by derivation from him. Nothing lesse. All grant that Christ doth immediately give it, even as the inward grace of every Sacrament commeth principally from him. The Church, did she give this power, might make the sacrament and preaching which one doth in order, no sacrament, no preaching. The Pope doth not (if we follow the common tenent) challenge so much as to give the power of order to any bishop or priest whatsoever. If you say, the Presbyter is ordained by the bishop, that is nothing: so is the bishop by other bishops, from whom notwithstanding he receiveth not this power. We will take this as granted of all: though the truth is, all doe not maintaine it from right grounds. But it will be said the Presbyter is inferiour in jurisdiction, and can have none but what is derived to him from the bishop, who hath the fulnesse of it within his Diocesan Church. But this is false, and grounded on many false presumptions. As first, that Ministers of the Word are not properly and fully Pastors; for to make a Pastor, and give him no help against the Wolfe, is to furnish him forth imperfectly. Secondly, it presupposeth the power of jurisdiction to be given originally and formally to one person of the Church, and so to others, whereas Christ hath committed it *originaliter* and *exercitative* to the representative Church, that they might Aristocratically administer it. Thirdly, this presupposeth the plenitude of regiment to be in the bishop, and from him to be derived to others; which maketh him a head of virtuall influence, that in his Church, which the Pope doth challenge in regard of all bishops. For his headship and spirituall soveraignty standeth according to *Bellarmine* in this, that the government of all *in foro externo*, is committed to him. Not to mention, how bishops, while they were bishops, gloried of their chaire and teaching, as the flower of their garland, preferring it farre before government, but when they were fallen from their spirituall felicity, and infected with secular smoke, then they recommended the labour of teaching to the Presbyters, then their jurisdiction and consistory did carry all the credite, every office in the Church being counted a dignity, as it had more or lesse jurisdiction annexed; as those are more or lesse honourable in the Common-wealth, which have civill authority in lesse or greater measure conjoyned. The truth is, it cannot be shewed that God ever made Pastor without this jurisdiction; for whether it do agree to men as they are Pastors, or as they are Prelats in the Church, it cannot be avoided but that the Pastor should have it, because though every *Praesul* or *Prelatus*, be not a Pastor, yet every Pastor is *Prelatus*, in order to that Church where he is the proper

and ordinary Pastor. Yea, when censure is the most sharp spirituall medicine, it were ill with every Church, if he who is resident always among them as their spirituall Physition, should not have power in administring it. Thirdly, I say, no Minister hath majority of power in applying the power of order or jurisdiction to this or that person. In the application there is a ministery of the Church interposed: but so that Christ onely is the cause with power, not onely why Presbyters are in the Church, but why *Thomas* or *John* is chosen to and best wed on this or that place. A Master onely doth out of power take every servant into his house: so God in his. God did choose *Aarons* sonnes with the Levites, and Christ the 70. not mediately leaving it to the arbitrement of any to set out those that should stand before him. God doth ever onely in regard of authority, apply all power Ecclesiasticall to every particular person, his sole authority doth it, though sometime as in ordinary callings, the ministery of others doth concurre. The Church is in setting out, or ordaining this or that man, as the Colledge is in chooſing, when she taketh the man whom the statute of her founder doth most manifestly describe, or where the Kings mandate doth strictly injoyne, it would otherwise bring an imperiall power into the Church. For though many Kings cannot hinder but that there shall be such and such officers, and places of government as are in their Kingdome, yet while they are free at their pleasure to depute this or that man to the places vacant, they have a Kingly jurisdiction in them. Briefly, God doth ever apply the power Ecclesiasticall unto the person: sometime alone by himselfe, as in the Apostles, and then he doth it: *tam immediatione suppositi quam virtutis*: sometime the ministery of man concurring extraordinarily, as when God extraordinarily directeth a person to goe and call one to this or that place, as he did *Samuel* to anoint *Saul*. Or else ordinarily, when God doth by his Writ and Spirit, guide men to take any to this or that place in his Church, which he doth partly by his written statutes, and partly by his Spirit; and thus he doth make the application onely *immediatione virtutis*, not *suppositi*.

Object. But yet Bishops have the Churches, and the care of them wholly committed to them; though therefore Ministers have equall power to them, yet they cannot without their leave have any place within their Churches, and therefore are inferiour, in as much as the people with whom they exercise their power of order and jurisdiction, are assigned to them by the Bishop the proper Pastor of them. This is an error likewise: For God doth make no Minister to whom he doth not assigne a flocke which he may attend. God calleth Ministers, not to a faculty of honour, which doth qualifie them with power to ministerial actions, if any give them persons among whom

they

they may exercise their power received, as the Emperours did make *Chartularies Judices*, who had a power to judge causes if any would subject himselfe to them. Or as the Count Palatine hath ordinary Judges, who are *habitu tantum judices*, having none under them, amongst whom they may exercise jurisdiction. Or as the University giveth the degree of a Doctor in Physicke, without any patients among whom he may practise. But Gods Ministery is the calling of a man to an actuall administration, *Goe teach*: and the power of order is nothing by the way, but a relative respect, founded in this, that I am called to such an actuall administration. Now there cannot be an act commanded, without the subject about which it is occupied: otherwise, God should give them a faculty of feeding, and leave them depending on others for sheep to feed; God should make them but remote potentiall Ministers, and the Bishop actuall. Thirdly, the Holy Ghost is said to have set the Presbyters over their flocke. A man taking a steward, or other servant into his house, doth give him a power of doing something to his family; and never thinketh of taking servants, further then the necessity of his houshold doth require: so is it with God in his Church, which is his house: fore the exegency of his people so require, he doth not call any to the function of Ministery. Againe, this is enough to ground the authority which Antichrist assumeth: For some make his soveraignty to stand onely in this, not that he giveth order or power of jurisdiction, but that he giveth to all Pastors and Bishops the moity of sheepe, on whom this their power is exercised, Christ having given him the care of all his sheepe, *feed my sheepe*: so *Vasquez*. Thus if a Bishop challenge all the sheepe in a Dioceſan flocke to be his, and that he hath power to assigne the severall flockes under him, he doth usurpe an Antichristian authority. Finally, if the Churches be the Bishops through the Dioceſſe, Ministers then are under them in their Churches, but as a Curate is, whom a Parson giveth leave to helpe within his Church. Yea, they should loose their right in their Churches, when the Bishop dieth, as a Curate doth when the Parson of this or that Church, whom he assisted, is once departed. To conclude, they are not dependant (one Minister I meane on another) in the exercise and use of their calling. A servant that hath any place, doth know from his Master what belongeth to it. The Priests and Levites had set downe what belonged to their places, as well as the high Priest what belonged to his. Againe, God hath described the Presbyters office, as amply as any other. A Legate dependeth on none for instructions, but on him that sendeth him; now every Minister is an Embassadour of Christ. By their reason a Minister should be accountant to man for what he did in his Ministery, if his exercising of it did depend on man. Then also,

should ministers mediately onely serve God, in as much as they have done this or that, to which the bishop did direct them. Moreover, should the bishop bid him not preach at al, preach rarely, teach onely such and such things, or come and live from his charge, he should not sinne in obeying him. But man cannot limit that power of ministery which he cannot give, for is not with Gods servants in his Church, as with civill servants in the Common-wealth: for here some servants are above others whom they command as they will such as are called *servi ordinarii* or *præpositi*, some are under others to do this or that commanded by them, commonly called *servi vicarii*: but in the Church all servants serve their Master Christ, neither having any that they can command, nor being under any but Christ so as to be commanded by them. But it may be objected, that God hath ordained some to be helpes and assistants to others some. It is said that God hath ordained powers, helps, governours, 1 Cor. 12. 8. and were not the Evangelists assistants to the Apostles, doing that to which they directed them? To this I answer, that the helps God hath put in his Church respect the calling of Deacons, and such as ministred to the mistresse ones? As for Evangelists, they were companions and assistants to the Apostles, but it was in order to the work of God in their hands, which they were to serve, not in order to their persons, as if they had been subjected to them in any servile inferiority. Observe how *Paul* speaketh of them, 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. *Titus* was his companion and helper towards them, *Phil.* 2. 25. *Epaphroditus* was his brother and helper in his worke, and fellow souldier, 1 *Thess.* 3. 2. *Timothy* was his coadjutor in the Gospell of Christ, 2 *Tim.* 4. 11. *Marke* was helpefull in the Ministery. The truth is, this was *servitus non personalis sed realis*, the Evangelists did serve the worke the Apostles had in hand, without being servants to their persons. When bricklayers worke, some mixe lime, and make mortar, some beare up tile and mortar, some sit on the house and there lay that which is brought them. These are all fellow servants, yet the one doth serve to set forward the worke of the other. But were they not left to the direction of the Apostles, wholly in exercise of their calling? I answer, as Christ gave some to be Evangelists, so he made them know from himselfe what belonged to their office, and what was the administration to which he called them. He did not therefore wholly leave them to the direction of any. There is a double direction, one *potestativa*, which is made from majority of rule *ex auctoritate*, the other *socialis*, such as one servant, having fit knowledge of his masters will, and ripe experience, may give to another. The latter kinde of direction it was, not the former, by which the Evangelists were directed. Which though commonly *Paul* used, yet not so universally but that they went sometime of their owne accords

hither

hither and thither, as may be gathered, 2 Cor. 8. 18, 19. and 2. 7. 24, 25.

The first Argument.

That which the Apostles had not over Prophets, Evangelists, Presbyters, nor Deacons themselves that power which the Church hath not over any member, the bishop hath not over other ministers. But they had not over any inferior officers any majority of directive or corrective power: neither hath the Church it selfe any such power. Ergo. The assumption is proved: for majority of directive and corrective power is a Lord-like and Regall power: now there is no such power in the Church, or in the Apostles, or in any but onely in that one Lord: all other power being but a declarative and exechtive ministery to signifie and execute what Christ out of majority of power would have signified and put in execution.

The sixth Argument.

That which doth breed an Antichristian usurpation, never was of Christs institution. But bishops majority of power in regard of order and jurisdiction, doth so: Ergo. That which maketh the bishop a head as doth *insture* derive the power of externall government to other his assistants that doth breed an Antichristian usurpation. But to claime the whole power of jurisdiction through a Diocesan Church, doth so: for he must needs substitute helpers to him, because it is more then by himselfe he can performe. But this is it which maketh Antichrist, he doth take upon him to be head of the whole Church, from whom is derived this power of externall government: and the bishop doth no lesse in his Diocesan Church, that which he usurpeth differing in degree onely and extension, not in kind from that which the Pope arrogateth. If it be said that his power is Antichristian, because it is universall: it is not so. For were the power lawfull, the universality could not make it Antichristian. The Apostles had an universality of authority, yet no Antichrists, because it did not make them heads, deriving to others from their fulnesse: it was not prince-like majority of power, but steward-like and ministeriall onely. If one doe usurpe a kingly power in Kent onely, he were an Anti king to our Soveraigne no lesse for kind, then if he proclaimed himselfe King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. There is but one Lord, and many ministrations. Neither doth this make the Popes power papall, because it is not under a Synod: for the best of the Papists hold, and it is the most common tenent, that he is subject to an Oecumenicall Councell. Secondly, though he be subject, yet that doth not hinder but he may usurpe a kingly government: for a King may have a kingly power, and yet confesse himselfe accountable to all his people collectively considered;

ted: neither doth this make the Bishops lawfull in one Church, because one may manage it, and the Popes unlawfull, because none is sufficient to sway such a power through the whole Church: for then all the power the Pope doth challenge, is not *per se*, but *per accidens*, unlawfull, by reason of mans unsufficiency, who cannot weild so great a matter.

The seventh Argument.

Those Ministers who are made by one patent in the same words, have equall authority: but all Ministers of the Word are made by the same patent, in the same words, *Receive the holy Ghost, whose sins ye forgive, &c.* Ergo. The proposition is denied: because the sense of the words is to be understood according as the persons give leave to whom they are spoken. These words spoken to Apostles, they gave them larger power then to a Bishop: and so spoken to a Presbyter they give him lesse power then to a Bishop. *Answ.* If the Scripture had distinguished of Presbyters Pastoral feeding with the Word, and made them divers degrees, as it hath made Apostles and Evangelists, then we would grant the exception: but the Scripture doth not know this division of Pastors and Doctors into chiefe and assistent; but speaketh of them as of Apostles and Evangelists, who were among themselves equall in degree. Wherefore as no Apostle received by these words greater power then another: so no Pastor or Teacher, but must receive the same power, as who are among themselves of the same degree. Secondly, were they different degrees, yet it should give the Presbyter for kind, though not of so ample extent as the Bishop hath, as it giveth the Bishop the same power for kinde, which the Apostles had, though not so universall, but contracted to particular Churches.

Now to come unto some conclusions or assertions which may lend light unto the deciding of this question.

Concl. 1. Let this be the first. No Minister of the Word hath any power but ministeriall in the Church. Power is naturall or morall. Morall is Civill or Ecclesiasticall. Civill is either Lord-like and ruling, or ministeriall and servile. So Ecclesiasticall, taken largely for all power subjectively in, or objectively about the Church, is either Lord-like and Regall, such as is in Christ, or it is ministeriall and servile, such as is in the Church and the principall members of it. The power therefore of the Apostles themselves and Evangelists, is called διακονία, Act. 20. 1 Tim. 4 yea such a service, as doth make the ministers having it, so servants, that they are no way Lords. *Many ministers, one Lord: we preach Christ, our selves your servants for Jesus sake.* S. *Paul* maketh his power steward-like, not regall. Now as that is regall power which doth any thing from the authority one hath in himselfe, or from ones pleasure: so that is ministeriall power

which

which doth nothing but eying the will and power of him that is principall: a power which signifieth or executeth this or that *ex mero alterius obsequio*.

Conclu. 2. This ministeriall power is no supernaturall vertue or quality inherent in the soule: but a relative respect founded on this, that I am called by God to this or that actuall administration in his Church. For it is not a power simply, whereby a man is made able to doe some supernatural act, which he could not before in any manner performe: but it is respectively said a power, in as much as it doth inable him to doe those acts in the Church of God lawfully, and *ex officio*, with which before he might not intermeddle. The power of a Deacon, Pastor, Evangelist, Apostle, belong to one predicament in regard of that which is the genus or common nature of them: the power of the Church cannot be other. Naturall and civill power doth with vertue and efficacy reach those effects and ends to which they are designed: because they are proportioned to them, and exceed not their activity: but Ecclesiasticall power cannot thus concur to the end and effects for which it is ordained: because they are such as the omnipotency of God onely can produce, as the converting or creating grace in the heart of a sinner, to which no supernaturall vertue in man can by any reall, though instrumentary efficacy, conduce any thing.

Conclus. 3. God hath not given ministeriall power to any, which himselfe is not personally to discharge, nor in further plenitude then that by himselfe it may be performed. The reason is, because God cannot give one the charge of doing more then a mans proper industry can atchieve, but he must withall put it in a mans power to take others, and to impart with them power of teaching and governing, so farre as may supply that defect which is in his strength to performe it alone. He that will have the end, will have that without which the end cannot be attained. If God would have any one an universall pastor to all the Churches of the world, he must needs allow him power to substitute Pastors here and there, deriving unto them power both to teach and governe, so far as may supply his absence in the Pastorall cure. If I will have one keepe my flockes which goe in twenty sheepe-gates, if I commit them to one, I must needs together give him leave to assume unto himselfe such as may be under shepheards to him. Thus if God give a Bishop the plenitude of Pastorall care and government over all the Parishionall Churches through a Dioceese, he must needs together allow him this power, of being a head of internall influence, even a head virtually communicating with others part of pastorall power, whether teaching or government. Thus should none but Bishops be *ex officio* servants in Pastorall cure to God: all others should be

immc-

immediately and formally servants to the bishop, and doe every thing in the name of the bishop, being immediately onely and in a remote sense the servants of God: as in the former comparison of one servant receiving from his master the care of all the flockes, he is the masters servant to whom the master committeth the trust, from whom he onely looketh to see it performed: but those whom this shepheard taketh to himselfe for his aid, they come under his dominion, and are servants to him. If it be said, that God doth not thus make the bishop Pastor, but that he will likewise that there be parish Pastors under him, and helps of government. To this I answer, If God will have them, then either after his owne designement, or else leaving it to the bishops arbitrement: if he leave it to the bishops arbitrement, then the objection before is in force; God will looke for the cure from him onely, he shall take according to his judgement, such as may helpe him. If God will have them after his owne designment, then he giveth the bishop no more Pastorall power then he can discharge himselfe, others having their right in all the bishop cannot execute, as well as the bishop, and as immediatly from Christ. Some write, as if the Apostles had the plenitude of all Pastorall power, that from them it might be derived to the Church, it being seene through nature, that inferiour things receive influence from the superiour. But they misconceive the matter; they had onely a power to serve the Church with the personall service of their Apostleship. The Pastorall power of Evangelists, or of ordinary Pastours and teachers, they never had. For as Christ gave the one order, so the two other also, for the gathering of the Saints, and edifying of the body of Christ: and no person in any rancke had any power to do this or that in the Church further then himselfe might performe in person. The steward in a house hath full power of a steward, but not the power of all other officers, as Clark of the kitchin, Butler, Chamberlaine, &c. So in these divers orders of servants in Gods house, his Church. If the Apostles had had the fulnesse of Pastorall care, they should then have ordained others Evangelists, and Pastors not onely by ministeriall mediation of their persons calling them, but also by mediation of vertue.

Conclus. 4. One ministeriall power may be in degree of dignity above another. For the power of one may be about more noble acts then the power of another, or in the same kinde, the power of one may be more extended, and the power of another more contracted. Thus the Deacons had for the object of their power and care, not so excellent a thing as that of Pastors, Evangelists, and Apostles. Thus the power of ordinary Pastors was not so universall as the Apostles, even as in the orders of servants domesticall, some are implied about lesser, some about greater and more honorable subjects.

Conci.

Concl. 5. No order of Ministers or servants can have majority of directive and corrective power over those who are in inferior order of Ministry and service. The reason is, because this exceedeth the bounds of ministeriall power, and is a participation of that despoticall power which is appropriate to the master of the family.

Concl. 6. Servants in one degree may have power to signifie their masters direction, and to execute ministerially what their master out of his corrective power inflicteth on their fellow servants in other degrees. Thus Pastors signifie Gods will to governing Presbyters and Deacons, what he would have them to doe in their places. Thus the Apostles might informe all orders under them.

Concl. 7. This power ministeriall tending to execute the pleasure of Christs corrective power, was committed to some in extraordinary degrees, personally and singularly, and might be so in some cases exercised by them. I meane singularity without concurrence of any others. This without doubt was in the Apostles and Evangelists: and it was needfull it should be so: first, because it might be behovefull there to excommunicate whereas yet Churches were not risen to their perfect frame: secondly, because there might be some persons not setled as fixed dwellers in any Church, whom yet to be cast forth was very behovefull. Againe, some Evangelists might incurre censure, as *Demas*, in such sort as no ordinary Churches power could reach to them.

Concl. 8. That ordinarily this power is not given to any one singularly by himselfe to exercise the same, but with the company of others constituting a representative Church: which is the point next to bee shewed. Yea where Churches were constituted, the Apostles did not offer to exercise their power, without the ministeriall concurrence of the Churches, as in the story of the Corinthians is manifest.

THE THIRD QVESTION

Whether Christ did immediatly commit ordinary power Ecclesiasticall, and the exercise of it, to any singular person, or to united multitude of Presbyters.

THough this question is so coincident with the former, that the grounds hath in a sort been discussed, yet for some new considerations which may be super-added, we will briefly handle it in the Method premised.

First, it is argued for the affirmative.

Argum. 1. That which is committed to the Church, is committed to the principal member of the Church. But exercise of jurisdiction was committed to the Church, Mat. 18. 17. Ergo. Either to the whole Church, or to a Church in the Church, or to some one eminent member in the Church. But it was not committed to be exercised by the whole Church, or to any Church in the Church. Ergo, to one who is in effect as the church, having all the authority of it. Secondly, if one person may be representatively a Church, when jurisdiction is promised; then one person may be representatively a Church when jurisdiction and power of exercising is committed. But one singular person, *Peter* signified the Church, when the promise of jurisdiction is made. Ergo. *Cyprian* to *Jubaia* saith, that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church so in the bishop, that they cannot be severed. Finally, as the kingdome of England may be put for the King in whom is all the power of the Kingdome: So the Church for the chiefe governour in whom is the power of it.

The second Argument.

That which the Churches had not given them when they were constituted, that was not promised to them as their immediat right. But they had not coercive power given them when they were constituted. Ergo, Christ did not commit it to the Churches or Presbyters

byters. For then the Apostles would not have withheld it from these. But they did. For the Apostles kept it with themselves. As in the incestuous Corinthian is manifest, whom *Paul* by his judgement was faine to excommunicate. And the Thessalonians are bid to note the inordinate, and signifie them, as not having power within themselves to censure them. And so *Paul* alone excommunicated *Hymenaus* and *Alexander*.

The third Argument.

That which *Paul* committed to some prime men in Churches, and their successours, that was not committed to Presbyteries, but singular persons. But in power of ordination and jurisdiction, he did so. For to *Timothy* in Ephesus, and to *Titus* in Crete, he commended the power and exercise of it. Ergo.

The fourth Argument.

That order which was most fit for exercising power of jurisdiction, that Christ did ordaine. But the order of one chiefe governour is fitter for execution, then the order of a united multitude. Ergo.

The fifth Argument.

If all authority and power of exercise be in the Church originally, then the Pastors derive their power from the Church. But this is not true. Ergo, it was not committed to the Church. That authority which the Church never had, shee cannot convey. But the Pastorall authority of word and Sacraments never was in the Church essentially taken. Ergo, it cannot be derived from her. Againe Pastours should discharge their office in the name of the Church, did they receive their power from the Church.

The sixth Argument.

If the power of jurisdiction and execution be committed from Christ to the Church, then hath the Church supreame power. Then may a particular Church depose her bishop, the sheepe censure the shepheard, children their fathers, which is absurd.

On the other side it is argued,

Argum. 1. That which Christ doth presuppose as being in many, and to be exercised by many, that never was committed by Christ to one, and the execution of any one. But Mat. 18. Christ doth manifestly suppose the power of jurisdiction to be in many, and that *exercitative*, so as by them being many, it is to be exercised. Ergo. Now this is plaine in the place Where first marke, that Christ doth presuppose the authority of every particular Church taken indistinctly. For it is such a Church as any brother offended may presently complaine to. Therefore no universall, or provinciall, or Dioceſan Church gathered in a Councell. Secondly, it is not any particular Church that he doth send all Christians to, for how all Christians in the world should come to one particular Church, were

it possible. He doth therefore presuppose indistinctly the very particular Church where the brother offending and offended are members. And if they be not both of one church, the plaintife must make his denuntiation to the Church where the defendant is, *quia forum sequitur reum.* Thirdly, as Christ doth speake it of any ordinary particular Church indistinctly, so he doth by the name of Church not understand essentially all the congregation. For then Christ should give not some, but all the members of the Church to be governors of it. Fourthly, Christ speaketh it of such a Church to whom wee may ordinarily and orderly complaine; now this we cannot to the whole multitude. Fiftly, this Church he speaketh of, he doth presuppose it as the ordinary executioner of all discipline and censure. But the multitude have not this execution ordinary, as all but *Morelius*, and such Democritall spirits doe affirme. And the reason ratifying the sentence of the Church, doth shew that often the number of it is but small: *For where two or three are gathered together in my name.* Whereas the Church or congregations essentially taken for teachers and people, are incomparably great. Neither doth Christ meane by Church the chiefe Pastor, who is virtually as the whole Church. For first, the word Church doth ever signifie a company, and never is found to note out one person. Secondly, the Bishop may be the person offending or offended, and the Church to which he must bring the matter, must be other then himselfe. Thirdly, the gradation doth shew it. First, by thy selfe, *Then shew a witnes or two. Then to the Church,* as the sinne increaseth, the number of those by whom it is to be rebuked and censured, increaseth also. If one say, though the Church signifie one governour, yet the gradation holdeth, for to tell it to the governour in open Court, is more then to tell it to twenty. Wee grant that this is true, and were the word Church taken here to note some eminent governour, it might be brought in as a further degree, though one onely were enforced. But how can *Peter* be complainant, if *Peter* the Præsul onely be the judge to whom the thing must be denounced. Fourthly, the church in the Corinthians which *Paul* stirreth up to censure the incestuous person, was not any one but many. Their rebuke upon which it is like he repented, was a rebuke of many, 2 Cor. 2.6. Fiftly, if the church had been one, he would not have subjoyned: *for what ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven.* Sixtly, if the church did not note an assembly, how could he assure them from hence, *that God would do what they agreed on, because he was with the last assemblies gathered in his name.* Unlesse the Church meant were an assembly, this argument could not be so correspondent. Where two or two or three are assembled in Gods name, God is in the midst of them to doe that they agree on. But where the Church is binding or loosing, there

are some assembled in the name of Christ. Ergo. Lastly, the church in the old Testament never noteth the high Priest virtually, but an assembly of Priests sitting together, as Judges in the causes of God. Wherefore as Christ doth indistinctly presuppose every particular Church: So he doth here onely presuppose the joint authority, and joint execution of a representative Church, a Presbytery of Elders who were Pastors and Governours.

Argum. 4. Wee argue from the practice of the Churches, That power which is not in one, nor to bee exercised by one, but in many, and to be exercised by many in the Church of the Corinthians, that power with the exercise of it, was committed by Christ to many, not to one. But the power of Ecclesiasticall censure was in many, and to be performed by many assembled. Ergo. The proposition is plaine. For *Paul* would not have called for, nor have liked any constitution or exercise of power Ecclesiasticall, other then Christ had ordained. The assertion is denyed by some: but it is a plaine truth by many invincible arguments. For first, *Paul* doth rebuke them that they had not set themselves to cast them forth. Now (as *Ambrose* saith on the place. *Si autem quis potestatem non habet, quem sit reum abjicere, aut probare non valet; immunis est.* Secondly, *Paul* doth wish them assembled together, with himselfe in the name and vertue of Christ, that they might deliver him up to Sathan. For hee doth not call on them to restraine him as already excommunicated, but to purge him out as an infectuous leaven yet amongst them. Thirdly, *Paul* doth tell them that they had power to judge those within, those who were called brethren, and lived otherwise. Fourthly, *Paul* doth tell them that they did a rebuke or mulct of many, writing to them that they would not proceed, 2 Cor. 2. Lastly, *Paul* doth attribute power to them to forgive him, and to receive him to the peace of the church. Which would not have been in them, had they not had the power to excommunicate. Such as have no power to binde, have no power to loose. So it might be proved by the Church of the Thessalonians, 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. *If any man will inordinatly, note him, that others may refraine him* Noting, being not a signification by letter, which doth wrest the word against all copies, and the current of all Greek interpreters: but judicially to note him, that all may avoid him; that is, excommunicate him. Finally, the churches of Asia, as it is plaine, had power of government within themselves.

Argum. 5. That power which the Apostles did not exercise in the churches, nor Evangelists, but with concurrence of the churches and Presbyteries, that power is much lesse to be exercised by any ordinary Pastour, but by many. But they did not ordaine, nor lay on hands alone, they did not determine questions by the power of the keyes alone, but with concurrence of the Presbyters of the church. Ergo, much lesse may any ordinary

Minister doe it alone. *Timothy* received grace by the χειροθεσία of the Presbytery. For that Persons must be understood here is apparant by the like place ; when it is said, by the laying on of my hands, μὴ noteth a person, and so here a Presbytery. Secondly, to take πρεσβυτέριον to signifie the order of Priesthood, is against all Lexicons, and the nature of the Greeke termination. Thirdly, *Timothy* never received that order of a Presbyter, as before we have proved. Fourthly, it cannot signifie as Greeke Expositers take it, a company of bishops. For neither was that Canon of 3. bishops and the Metropolitan, or all the bishops in a Province, in the Apostles time, neither were these who are now called bishops, then called Presbyters, as they say, but Apostles, men that had received Apostolick grace, Angels, &c. Finally, it is very absurd to think of companies of other Presbyters in Churches then *Paul* planted ; but he placed Presbyteries of such Presbyters as are now distinguished from bishops, which is the grant of our adversaries. Not to mention how *Armachanus* doth censure the other as an interpretation from ones privat sence, besides testimonie of Scripture.

Thus the Apostles did not offer alone to determine the question Act. 15. but had the joynt suffrages of the Presbytery with them. Not because they could not alone have infallibly answered, but because it was a thing to be determined by many; all who had received power of the keyes, doing it *ex officio*, and others from discretion and duty of confession the truth. Yea the bishops called *Primi Presbyteri*, had no ordination at the first which the Prebytery did not give them. Whence have bishops of other Churches power to minister the sacrament to the bishop of this Church ? But *Timothy* and *Titus* are said to have ordained Ministers. As Consuls and Dictators are said to have created Consuls, because they called Senates, propounded and together with others did it. No otherwise doe Jesuits themselves understand it. *Salmeron* on the first of *Titus*, *&c.* And it is manifest by Ecclesiasticall writings of all sorts, that Presbyters had right of suffrage, not onely in their owne Presbyteries, but in Provinciall Synods, and therefore in Oecumenicall Synods, which doth arise from a combination of the other, to which their mindes went in the instruction of bishops received from their Churches. And *Athanasius* yet a Deacon, is read to have beene at the Counsell of Nice, and to have had right of suffrage in it. Finally, the Presbyteries did a long time execute jointly all actions of Church government, as is before declared. Other arguments we shall touch in answer of these which have beene objected. Now to come to the conclusions, let this be first.

Concluj. 1. Extraordinary power was committed to some singu-

lar

lar persons, so that in some case they might singularly exercise it without concurrence of other. This I speake in regard of Apostles and Evangelists, whose power in many things could not have concurrance of particular Churches, which in the former question is sufficiently declared.

Conclus. 2. That ordinary power, and the execution therof was not committed to any singular governors, whereof there was to be one onely in each Church. This is against the Jesuits, who make account (the most of them) that as all civill power of government is given to Kings to bee executed by them within their commonwealth, so Ecclesiasticall power (say they) is given to the Pope and to bishops in their particular Churches to be executed by them, and derived from them to the whole Church.

Conclus. 3. Ordinary power with the execution thereof, was not given to the community of the church, or to the whole multitude of the faithfull, so that they were the immediate and first receptacle, receiving it from Christ, and virtually deriving it to others. This I set downe against the Divines of Constance; our prime Divines, as *Luther* and *Melanchon*, and the Sorbonists, who doe maintaine it at this day. Yea, this seemeth to have beene *Tertullians* errour; for in his booke: *de pudicitia*, he maketh Christ to have left all Christians with like power, but the church for her honor, did dispose it as we see. The proposition of a politick body, and naturall deceived them, while they will apply all that is in these to Christs mysticall body, not remembring that *analogon* is not *in omnisimile*, for then should it bee the same with the *analogatum*. True it is, all civill power is in the body politicke, the collections of subjects, then in a King from them: And all the power of hearing, seeing, they are in the whole man, which doth produce them effectually, though formally and instrumentally they are in the eare and eye. But the reason of this is, because these powers are naturall, and what ever is naturall, doth first agree to the community or *totum*, and afterward to a particular person and part, but all that is in this body, cannot hold in Christs mysticall body. In a politick body power is first in th community, in the King from them, but all Ecclesiasticall pow first in our King before any in the church from him. Bu should he first commit this power, but to his Quee sidering this power is not any Lordly power, bu service to the church for Christ his sake. Theref be committed to some persons, and not to th which are the Queene of Christ. For it is not fi mit power to his Queene to serve herselfe persons who in regard of his relation from her. Secondly, in naturall bo

immediately in the man, from the man in the eye and particular members: In the mysticall body, the faith of a beleever is not first immediatly in all, then in the beleever, but first of all and immediatly in the personall beleever; for whose good it serveth more properly then for the whole, every man being to live by his owne faith. The power of Priesthood was not first in the Church of Israel, so derived to the Priest: but immediatly from Christ seated in *Aaron* and his sonnes. *Object.* Yea they were given the church *intuitu ejusdem tanquam finis & totius.* *Answ.* But this is not enough, that power may be said to be immediatly received by the church as the first receptacle of it, and from it derived to others, as the power of seeing is not onely given *intuitu hominis* as the end of it, and the *totum* to whom it agreeth, but is *in homine* as the first subject from whom it commeth to the eye. But the power even of ordinary Ministers is not in the church. For as all are said not to have beene Apostles, so not to have beene Doctors. But if the power of ordinary teaching had been given to every beleever, all should have beene made Doctors, though not to continue so in exercising the power. Secondly, were the power in the church, the church should not onely call them, but make them out of vertue and power received into her selfe: then should the church have a true Lordlike power in regard of her Ministers. Besides, there are many in the community of Christians uncapable of this power regularly, as women and children. This conclusion in my judgement *Victoria, Soto* & others deny with greater strength of reason then the contrary is maintained.

Conclus. 4. Fourthly, ordinary power of ministeriall government is committed with the execution of it, to the Senat or Presbytery of the church. If any faile in any office, the church hath not power of supplying that, but a ministery of calling one whom Christ hath described, that from Christ he may have power of office given him in the place vacant.

Conclus. 5. Lastly, though the community have not power given her, yet such estate by Christ her husband is put on her, that all power is to bee executed in such manner, as standeth with respect

[illegible] v. Hence it is, that the governours are in many things [illegible] to take the consent of the people with them. Not [illegible] power of the keyes with them, but because they [illegible] of the spouse of Christ, and therefore cannot bee [illegible] without open dishonour in such things, which [illegible] the whole congregation.

[illegible] ments first propounded.

[illegible] vllogisme is denyed. *That what was* [illegible] *to some principall member.* And [illegible] vllogisme, proving this part denyed,

denyed. *For the power and execution was committed to a Church in a Church.* Which is so farre from absurdity, that he is absurd who doth not see it in Civill and Sacred. Doe we not see in Parliament a representative Common-wealth within our Common-wealth, having the greatest authority? Not to mention that a Church within a Church should not be strange to them who imagine many Parishionall churches within one Diocesan church. To the proofes which prevent as it were an objection, shewing that the church, *Mat.* 18. 17. may be put for one chiefe Governour.

The proposition is denyed. *If that Peter one Governour, may be in type and figure the Church to whom the jurisdiction is promised, then the Church receiving and executing it may be one.* A most false Proposition whose contrary is true. The reason is, because the church typified by *Peter* is properly and really a church, not figuratively and improperly: for then *Peter* should have beene a figure or type, of a type or figurative church. The figure therefore and type being of the church which is properly taken, and the church properly and really taken, being a company assembled, hence it is that (*Matth.* 18. 17.) the church cannot signifie one; for one is but figuratively and improperly a church. There is not the same reason of the figure and the thing that is figured. Nay hence an Argument may be retorted, proving that by that church whereof *Peter* was a figure, is not meant one chiefe Governour. *Peter* as one man or Governour was properly and really a virtuall church and chiefe Governour. But *Peter* as one man and Governour was in figure onely the church. *Matth.* 18. Ergo, that church *Matth.* 18. is not a virtuall church, noting forth one chiefe Governour onely. As for *Cyprians* speech, it doth nothing but shew the conjunction of Pastour and people by mutuall love, which is so streight that the one cannot be schismatically left out, but the other is forsaken also. Otherwise I thinke it cannot be shewed to the time of *Innocent* the third, that the Bishop was counted the church; or this dreame of a virtuall church once imagined. The Clerkes of the church of *Placentia* did in their oath of canonicall obedience sweare thus: *That they would obey the Church of Placentia, and the Lord their Bishop.* Where the Chapiter doth carry the name of the church from the Bishop. Yea, even in those times preposed, or set before him, when the Pope was lifted up above generall councels, then it is like was the first nativity of these virtuall churches. As for a Kingdome I doubt not, but it may be put for a King figuratively: but the church typified by *Peter*, must needs be a church properly. And it will never be proved that any one Governour was set up in a church proportionable to a King in a Common-wealth, in whom is all civill power whereby the whole Kingdome is administred.

To the second Argument from the Apostles fact in the Church of Corinth, who judicially (absent) sentenced his excommunication, *I have decreed or judged*, leaving nothing to the Church, but out of their obedience to decline him, as in the 2. Epist. 2. he saith, *For this cause I have written to you, that I may proove whether you will in all things bee obedient.* What Arguments are these? He that judgeth one to be excommunicated, hee leaveth no place for the Presbyters and Church of Corinth judicially to excommunicate. Thus I might reason, *Act.* 15 17. from *Iames*, ἐγω κρίνω He who doth judicially sentence a thing hee leaveth no place to other Apostles and Presbyters to give sentence. The truth is, the Apostle might have judged him to be excommunicate; and an Evangelist, if present, might have judged him also to be excommunicate, and yet place left for the Churches judgement also. These are subordinate one to the other. Here it may be objected, that if place be left for the Churches judgement after the Apostles sentence; then the Church is free not to excommunicate where the Apostles have, and the same man should bee excommunicate and not excommunicate. *Ans.* Suppose the Apostles could excommunicate *Clave errante*, Without cause, it is true. But the Apostles sentence being just, shee is not free, in as much as shee cannot lawfully but doe that which lyeth on her; when now it is especially shewed her, and by example shee is provoked. Yea, where she should see just cause of excommunicating she is not (though none call on her) free not to excommunicate. Nevertheless, though she is not free, so as she can lawfully not excommunicate, yet she is free, speaking of freedome absolutely and simply, and if she should not excommunicate him, hee should remaine not excommunicable but excommunicate, by chiefe judgement, yet it should not be executed, by the sinister favour of a particular Church. As, say *Sauls* sentence had beene just, and the peoples favour had beene unjust, *Ionathan* had beene under condemnation, but execution had beene prevented by the peoples headstrong affection towards him. *Ob.* So they who obeyed *Paul* they did not judicially excommunicate. *Ans.* As though one may not exercise power of government by manner of obedience to the exhortation of a superior. Touching the place in the *Thessalonians*, those that read, *Note him by an Epistle*; doe goe against the consent of all Greeke Interpreters. And the context doth shew, that it is a judiciary noting one, such as caused him to bee avoided by others, and tended to breed shame in him. As for *Pauls* excommunicating *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, It will not follow. That which he did alone an ordinary Pastor may doe alone. Secondly, it is not like he did it alone; but as he cast out the Corinthian, though the whole proceeding be not noted. Though *Paul* saith, *I delivered*

them

them. So he saith, grace was given *Timothy* by imposition of his hands, 2 *Tim.* 1.6. when yet the Presbytery joyned, 1 *Tim.* 4.14 Thirdly, it may be they were no fixed members in any constituted Church.

The third argument of *Timothy* and *Titus* hath beene sufficiently discussed.

To the fourth, *That one is fitter for execution then many.* To which we may adde, that though the Bishops be out as Consuls in a Senat, or Vice-chancellors in a University, having when they sit with others, no more power then the rest. Yet these have execution of many things committed to them. The assertion, viz. *That many are lesse fit for execution,* we deny. That order is fittest which God instituted. But he doth commit the keyes to the Church, to many, that they might exercise the authority of them; when that mean is most fit, which God will most blesse, and his blessing doth follow his owne order, this is the fittest. Secondly, in the Apostles times, and in the times after, almost foure hundred yeeres expired, Presbyters did continue with Bishops in governing and executing what ever was decreed. Thirdly, this deprivation from the first order, one to execute for a Diocesan, one for a Provinciall, the decrees of a Diocesan and Provinciall, drew on a necessity of one to execute the decrees of the Oecumenicall Church or Pope. Fourthly, Let them shew where God divided the power of making lawes for government of any Church from the power to execute them. Regularly they who have the greater committed, have the lesser also. Fifthly, we see even in civill governments many parts by joynt Councell and action are as happily governed as others are by a singular governour. Truely, that the African Fathers write to *Celestine* is true: *It is unlikely that God will be present with one, inspiring him with his spirit, and not be present with many who are in his name, and with his warrant assembled.* As for those comparisons they hold not in all: they hold in that which the Consull doth in calling the assembly, propounding things, &c. Yet the Consuls never took the power to censure their fellowes without the concurrence of their fellow Senators, nor to withdraw themselves from being subject to the censure of the rest of the Senate.

To the fift argument, to the proposition by distinction: if they have all power both of ministeriall application, and instituting others out of vertue and authority, then Pastours derive. But this is denyed. She hath no power but of Ministery, and no plenitude but so farre as they in their owne persons can discharge. It presupposeth therefore we affirme in our question what we doe not. But to let the proposition passe, because of some derivation, it is true. If she have but all power of Ministeriall application, then Bishops

derive from her. But they doe not. We say they doe. And whereas it is objected, that which the Church neuer had she cannot convey it. I answer, that which the Church never had, she cannot virtually convey it. but she may as ministering to him who hath the power and vertue of deriving it. Nothing can give that which it hath not, either formally or virtually, unlesse it give it as an instrument to one who hath it. A man not having a penny of his owne, may give an hundred pounds if the King make him his Almoner. A Steward may give all offices in his masters house, as ministerially executing his masters pleasure. Thus the Church deriveth, as taking the person whom Christ describeth, and out of power will have placed in this or that office in his Church. This answereth to the last suggestion. For if the Church did virtually, and out of power make an officer, it is true, as we see with those whom the King maketh in the common-wealth. But if she doe it in Steward-like manner, ministring to the sole Lord and master of his house, then is not he so taken in to doe in his name, but in his masters name. As a Butler taken in by a servant, doth execute his office not in master Stewards name, but in his masters, who onely out of power did confer it on him.

The last objection I answer. That the particular Church may depose their Bishop. What member soever in the Church is the offending person, may be complained of to the Church. The Church of Philippi, if it had power to see that *Archippus* doe his dutie, then it had power to reprove and censure him not doing it. If the Church have power by election to choose one their Bishop, and so power of instituting him, then of destituting also. *Instituere & destituere ejusdem est potestatis.* But he is given the onely judge in Christs roome, and though they elect him, yet as you have said, and truely, they have not the power of that authority in them to which he is elected. No more then the Electors of the Emperour have in them power of the Imperiall dignity. *Answer.* We say therefore, that as the Church hath onely ministeriall power of application, that is, as they cannot out of power call a Pastour, but onely call one whom Christ pointeth out, and to whom Christ out of power giveth the place of Pastour. So she cannot censure or depose, but onely ministerially executing the censure of Christ, who will have such a one turned out, or otherwise censured. But the Bishop never was sole judge, though κατ' ἐξοχὴν he may be said so. Christ instituted a Presbytery, in which all had equall power of judgement. *Cyprian Ep. 68.* in the case of *Basilides* and *Martialis*, doth shew that the Church had power as of chooſing worthy, so of refusing unworthy. He speaketh of an ordinary power, as by chooſing is manifest, not extraordinary and in case of necessitie. And Mr. *Field* maintaineth, that

that *Liberius* was lawfully deposed by the Church of Rome. Surely I marvell men of learning will deny it, when no reason evinceth the Pope though a generall Pastor subject to the censure of a Church Oecumenicall, but the same proveth a Diocesan Bishop subject to the censure of the particular Church. Unlesse they will say with some Schoolmen, *Soto*, viz. That the Pope is but the vicar of Christ in the generall Church: but the Bishop is both the vicar of Christ, and also representeth the generall Church in his Diocesse, whence he cannot be proceeded against by the Church that is a particular. As if to be a vicar of Christ were a lesser matter then to represent the generall Church, with whom in his calling the Church Oecumenicall hath nothing to doe.

To that which is objected touching Fathers, Pastors; the similitudes hold not in all things. Naturall parents are no wayes children, nor in state of subjection to their children: but spirituall fathers are so fathers, that in some respect they are children to the whole Church. So shepherds are no way sheepe, but ministers are in regard of the whole Church. Secondly, Parents and Shepherds are absolutely parents and shepherds, be they good or evill: but spirituall Parents and Pastors are no longer so then they doe accordingly behave themselves. Besides, are not civill Kings Parents and Pastors of their people? yet if they be not absolute Monarches, it was never esteemed as absurd, to say that their people had power in some cases to depose them. If their owne Churches have no power over them, it will be hard to shew wherein others have such power of jurisdiction over persons who belong not to their owne churches. But Lord Bishops must take state on them, and not subject themselves unto any triall, but by their Peeres onely, which is by a Councell of Bishops.

FINIS.

we will hear thee again of this matter. Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and believed, &c. We doubt not but there are many within the Province; whose hearts *the Lord will open, to attend to what is here said.* Our desire is to do good unto all, even unto those that are our greatest adversaries; and not *to be overcome of evil, but to overcome evil with good.* If they mock at us (as they did at *Paul*) yet surely, *Our Judgment is with the Lord, and our work with our God; He that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is unjust, let him be unjust still:* But we hope better things of you, that have submitted to the Presbyterian-Government. For whom we pray, *That the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our* Lord Jesus Christ, *that great Shepherd of his sheep, through the bloud of the everlasting* Covenant, *would make you perfect in every good work, to do his Will; working in you, that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through* Jesus Christ; *to whom be glory for ever and ever,* Amen.

Isa. 49. 4.

Heb. 13. 19, 20.

Subscribed in the Name, and by the Appointment of the Assembly,

George Walker, Moderator.
Arthur Jackson, *Edmund Calamy*, } Assessors.
Roger Drake, Scriba.
Elidad Blackwell, Scriba.

FINIS.

...mination. ... to the ...

READER, be pleased to ... unwilling to ... *let every one, for ...* these ... and advise ... venture? It is not ... why ancient men and ... st; for ... der the Prelatical ... Jld

John Christie

$$\frac{9\frac{1}{2}}{2\ 3\ 7}$$